THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 4. JULY, 1928. Vol. XVIII.

THE BOOK AND THE BISHOPS

By the Editor.

THE rejection of the Revised Deposited Book by 268 to 222 votes in a House of Commons, in which only 93 were absent unpaired, is decisive, and it is not rendered less decisive by the fact that in December last the Deposited Book was rejected by 240 to 207 votes in a House in which 137 were absent unpaired. Six months' consideration of the Book, accompanied as that consideration was by a number of explanations and alterations calculated to remove objections to the Book, failed entirely to weaken the opposition to it. Analysis of the House of Commons' vote shows that 22 more representatives of English constituencies voted against the Book on the second than on the first occasion. The better the Book was understood, the less it was liked. Opposition was increasing with the passage of time. This is a very significant fact.

Many, including a number of Modernists, regret the rejection of the Book. We feel no regret. We believe, unpopular as such a conviction must be in official Church circles, that the voting in the House of Commons is much more truly representative of the mind of the Church than is the voting in the Church Assembly. The Church Assembly vote, although representative of the mind of the ecclesiastical bureaucracy, is not yet representative of the rank and file of Church people. Moreover, there was much that was artificial in the Church Assembly support. Every diplomatic device, every form of inducement that could properly be used, was used in the interests of the Book.

Our Church leaders may not be statesmen, but they deserve credit as diplomatists and politicians. If they failed, it is not because they left any stone unturned : support was begged or commandeered from every quarter. There is nothing in the least discreditable in this, but it prohibits us from regarding the Church Assembly's votes as representative of the spontaneous feeling—'the native wood-notes wild'—of the Church of England. The Assembly's vote represented the skilfully presented policy of a very influential and highly organized group of Church of England officials and their allies, rather than the convictions of the great majority of parochial clergy and laity. Yet if the measure was to succeed from the administrative point of view, it was necessary that it should have a very large measure of enthusiastic Church support behind it. As time went on it became clear to the House of Commons that this support was lacking, not simply among extreme Anglo-Catholics and extreme Evangelicals, but among a large body of moderate Church folk. It seemed clear that the Book would operate not for the settling of differences, but rather as a constant source of widespread contention.

We do not hold with the statement of the *Church Times* in its leading article of June 22, that :

> The story of the Bishops and the Prayer-Book is a steady progress from blunder to blunder, and from bad to worse.

We take the view that the Bishops evolved a policy of Prayer-Book revision which strove to kill two birds with one stone, but in the estimation of many non-episcopal persons seemed likely to miss both birds—on the one hand a liturgical revision which would modernize and enrich our services, and on the other hand a disciplinary policy which would secure peace and order in the parishes. Unfortunately the attempt to satisfy one demand, defeated the other. As the mediaevalist or Romanizing party were the chief sources of parochial disorder and dissension, it was felt necessary to make liturgical concessions to them in order to secure their submission to the new disciplinary policy. The concessions made were not large enough to secure their loyal support, but served to arouse a powerful apprehension in the mind of the great body of anti-mediaevalist Churchmen and to provoke their opposition. The Revision was not sufficiently radical for the Modernists, nor sufficiently Protestant for the

Evangelicals, nor sufficiently Romanist for the Anglo-Catholics. This being so, it failed to secure the needful support in the Church, and so could not become a means of peace and order. This the House of Commons perceived, and felt unable to legalize a Book for so divided a Church. It may be urged that the Bishops, with the exception of six, believed that they could secure peace and order if the Book were legalized. The Commons doubted the ability of the Bishops to do this in view of their past failures. It may be claimed that the House of Commons' vote indicates a lack of confidence in the episcopate. This we believe to be the case. The recent utterances and actions of some of the Bishops were in some degree responsible for this. But we are convinced that there was no desire on the part of the Commons to tyrannize over the Church, but a very real desire to discover the true mind of the Church and to act for her benefit. This we believe the House of Commons has succeeded in doing.

We hope all our Church officials will be won to this view of the action of the House of Commons, and will at least believe that that body acted as it did from a sincere desire to serve the Church's best interests. If these officials persist in speaking of this action of the House as 'deplorable,' at least we hope that they will acknowledge that it is 'deplorable' only in its effect, not in its intention. And we believe that later on it will become clear to them that it has not been even deplorable in its effect, but entirely profitable.

Our Church authorities have prayed, and constantly urged others to pray, that the High Court Parliament might be guided to a right decision. These prayers have been uttered, and we are sure in no perfunctory manner. Ought we not then to feel that in the decisions of the Commons we have the Divine answer to the prayers of the Church? When the natural feeling of disappointment and irritation has died down, and the Church authorities with Christian patience and meekness again take up as *servi servorum Dei* their task of Prayer-Book Revision, they will come to recognize that the double rejection has been all to the good. The Primate's declaration to those who were impatient for the completion of the task of revision, that 'The longer it takes, the better it will be,' possesses a prophetic note. So long as we get the right thing at last, we ought not to grieve at a few well-intentioned failures.

Had the Revised Deposited Book been legalized, almost certainly disaster would have ensued. The Bishops would have become discredited because it would have become steadily clearer that they were failing to secure order and peace in the parishes, although it was generally understood that they had solemnly promised these things if the Book were legalized. The definite legalizing of Reservation—practically perpetual Reservation—and in circumstances which permitted of Adoration of the Reserved Sacrament in our parish churches, would have repelled many Evangelicals from our communion and have rendered future closer association with Free Churchmen impossible. Moreover, it would have assisted the further alienation from the Church of the younger and more intelligent members of the rising generation. We know that many, probably all Modernists, were quite ready to concede Reservation for communicating the sick, but we know that under the regulations of the Revised Deposited Book, Reservation for Adoration would have grown apace. If such a practice is to increase, it is better that it should grow without legal permission until a rising standard of education among our clergy weakens the practice, and in the end allows it to fall into desuetude.

Modernists have favoured the Deposited Book because of the concessions the Revision made to modern knowledge. These concessions were extremely moderate, indeed almost exiguous, both in quality and in quantity. Had the revision been legalized, it is possible that it would have closed the door for half a century to further liturgical revision on Modernist lines. Now, however, the door is still open, and whilst educational work in the Church proceeds, there is every hope that the coming revision will look more to the future both in the spheres of modern thought and modern knowledge, and also in that of Church reunion, than did the rejected Book.

As Modernists we are more concerned with liturgical revision on the lines of modernization and enrichment than with the problems of liturgical order. Of course we do not desire to see Romanizing increase in the English Church, but in our hearts we are convinced that no satisfactory and permanent suppression of Romanizing can be secured by disciplinary measures. The modern education of the clergy can alone eliminate it. Meanwhile we earnestly desire the Bishops, for the initiative

rests with them, to give us a non-contentious revision of the Prayer-Book which will abstain from dealing with those controversial issues which have wrecked the present measure. If it be complained, when such a Book is authorized, that disorders still continue in the Church, the Bishops can very reasonably reply: 'You would not sanction the Prayer-Book with which we undertook to restore liturgical order. You demanded liturgical modernization and enrichment, that we have been able to give you. Liturgical order will no doubt come in due season, but it is a slow process as it depends upon securing loyalty and unity as the product of a common educational policy wisely and perseveringly pursued over a period of years.'

There are three points in this very difficult issue that we desire particularly as Modernists to emphasize.

The first is our respect, and that of all Modernists, for the great wisdom which has marked the Primate's guidance of affairs ever since the first rejection of the Book in December. When we contrast his public utterances with those of other ecclesiastical leaders and their allies, we are more than ever impressed by his wisdom in circumstances of extreme difficulty. His advice, and that of the Archbishop of York, given on the morrow of the second rejection should be constantly remembered.

> The Prayer Book Measure has failed to obtain full Parliamentary sanction. Some of those who have eagerly supported it as a right step on the roadway to orderliness, to harmony, and to new freedom for active service at home and overseas, may be led by disappointment or irritation to advocate forthwith rash or irregular action. May we plead for quietness, for a little patience, and for abstention from any angry or unkindly word?

The second point we desire to emphasize is our hearty concurrence with the ideal of Church freedom and authority as defined by the Primate in his recent address to the Church Assembly.

> 'It is a fundamental principle that the Church—that is the Bishops together with the clergy and laity—must in the last resort, when its mind has been fully ascertained, retain its inalienable right, in loyalty to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to formulate its faith in Him and to arrange the expression of that faith in its forms of worship.'

Our third point concerns the real and increasing danger of Prelacy in the Church of England. It is observable even in the above definition that a capital letter is used for the Bishops, but not for the clergy and laity. The passing of the Enabling Act and subsequent legislation, and the conditions which have en-

sued, have increased very considerably the power of the Bishops. This, together with frequent secret conclaves of the Bishops, and the ready acceptance of the *mot d'ordre*, 'The Bishops must all act together,' is threatening the Church with prelatical domination. If this developes, it will only lead, if we know anything of the English spirit, to the inauguration of a policy of Breaking the Bishops, which like the Root and Branch policy of Laudian days must give no little pain and trouble to many people and interfere greatly with the work of the Church. Some of the Bishops have been complaining that the Rejected Book has been called 'the Bishops' Book.' It would be well if our Bishops would meditate upon the significance of this designation, rather than complain of its injustice.

> 'There is a soul of goodness in things evil
> Would men observingly distil it out.'

On the morning after the first rejection of the Book a Yorkshire milkman announced the news to a cook of a Yorkshire household succinctly as follows: 'The I Am's have got it in the neck.' Such is the growing sense of infallibility manifest in our episcopate that one might think the Oecumenical Creed had declared that the Holy Ghost spake by the Bishops, whereas it asserts that He 'spake by prophets,' and as we study Church History we observe how very true this statement is. Few indeed are the Bishops who have been prophets. If there be a prophetic order in the Church, it must be sought in the priesthood or among the laity.

The mediaeval jurist Bracton laid down the great principle for the English King that he is not under any man. He is under God and the laws. That is what we desire to feel with regard to our Bishops, and, we may add, that we desire them to feel it also. The English Bishop is in no sense a lord over God's heritage. He is a constitutional ruler. He only sees his office rightly when he keeps two important facts steadily in sight. The first fact is this, that in relation to the priesthood, the Bishop, as Church History and St. Jerome teach, is *primus inter pares*, 'the first among equals.'

The second fact is this: that the priesthood of the Christian laity, that is of every Christian man and woman, is the source and strength of the *representative* priesthood of the Bishop, as Holy Scripture and Bishop Lightfoot teach. This is a fun-

damental doctrine of the constitution of the Christian Church, and it reveals to us the true source of the Church's moral and spiritual authority.

When a Bishop is ever mindful of these two facts, he learns how to behave himself in the Church of God, and that not as a prelatical personage but as a Christian Bishop, and so he avoids two dangerous pitfalls. The first is the danger which arises from regarding the laity as an inferior order who exist only to be led and ruled and taught instead of as brothers and sisters in Christ, to be inspired both by spirit and example.

The second is the danger that the Bishops may forget that they are as much under the law as are priests and laymen : that so far are those who administer the law from standing above the law that they are themselves as much subject to the law as those whom they direct to obey it. This last point has a very serious bearing upon the future policy and action of the Bishops. The Bishops have no power of themselves to make the law of the Church of England, their function is to administer it and to obey it. It they attempt on their sole authority to make it, they are doing that which it is unlawful for them to do, and thereby they forfeit all moral authority, and the power to invoke the obedience of their subordinates. Any plea of necessity for wrong action on their part would prove as fatal both to them and to their cause as it did to the Kaiser Wilhelm when he infringed the neutrality of Belgium.

CHURCH AND STATE

By G. G. Coulton, D.Litt., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

THIS paper's title is *Church and State* : but, simple as the title sounds, it conceals one distressing ambiguity. We are all agreed, roughly at least, as to what we mean by *State*; but what is the *Church?* That brief monosyllable has had many definitions, some of them quite irreconcilable with others. The great Church father Tertullian, writing less than two centuries after Christ's death, insisted that, though the Church has ordained a body of clergy apart from the laity as a matter of order, yet this difference between clergy and laity is not fundamental. He says :

> 'Are not we lay folk also priests? As it is written: *He hath made us a kingdom, and priests unto God and His Father* . . . Where three men are, there is a church, even though they be lay-folk; for each liveth by his own faith.'

Compare that with the words of one of the greatest Popes, Innocent III, a thousand years later. Writing to the Patriarch of Constantinople, and commanding his obedience, he said:

> 'Christ committed to Peter not only the whole Church, but also the whole world to govern.'[2]

And, a century later again, Boniface VIII, in his bull *Unam Sanctam*, proclaimed officially to the world that subjection to the Pope is a primary condition of salvation for every human being. From two Popes, then, we have very much the same answer which we should get from an Irish peasant of to-day, who would laugh at the idea that he himself was in any sense a priest, or that three people could make a Church. To him the Church is necessarily a world-wide community under military organization, in which he himself obeys the priest, and the priest his bishop, and his bishop the Pope; and all men outside this disciplined army are either deceivers or deceived. This contrast between different definitions is strictly relevant to our discussion of this evening. The Church in Tertullian's sense could scarcely, under any conceivable conditions, come into conflict with any moderately reasonable and tolerant State. But the Church in the Irish peasant's sense must unavoidably be in constant rivalry, and even in frequent conflict, with any strongly-organized State; unless, indeed, that State be entirely governed by men of the Pope's own persuasion, and therefore consistently intolerant of all nonconformity except on the most negligible scale. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that Tertullian represents the ascent of Christian teaching, Innocent the descent of Christian teaching. In 220 A.D. it was for the individual to become a Christian, to live as a Christian, thus to propagate the faith both in word and in practice, and gradually to form a Christian State. But a thousand years later, in 1200 A.D., it was for the State to be Christian and to enforce religion upon its subjects; by persuasion if possible, but, if necessary, even by the severest punishments. And, to bring the question into still closer actuality for the present moment, let me sum it up in an

[1] *De exhort Castitatis*, c.7.
[2] *Epp.* lib. II, No. 209.

epigram which I hope is no more one-sided than other similar attempts to put the matter into two words: Tertullian practically represents the Quaker claim; Innocent represents that of the modern Catholic, whether Roman or Anglican. If religion, as the Quaker insists, ought to grow mainly upwards through the individual and united aspirations of ordinary human beings at their best, then there is no real problem of Church and State. If, on the other hand, religion is mainly to be taught downwards to the people by a professional caste, then this problem of Church and State is scarcely less thorny and less complicated than even the standing problem of international War and Peace.

But upon what, historically, does this Catholic theory rest? (I use the word *Catholic* under protest, believing it to be a misnomer, just as the Catholic uses under protest the word *Reformation*.) It rests upon the assumption that there exists a definite teaching Church, conceived as such by Christ, handed on by Him to the Apostles, and by them to all whom they might afterwards commission under certain recognized forms. According to this theory, the decision of the episcopate and priesthood, made deliberately at any important crisis, is in effect the voice of God. But this theory will not be a serious examination in the light of history. When John the Baptist's disciples came to Christ and asked, 'Art thou He that should come, or do we look for another?' that question was the most fundamental that has ever agitated the Christian enquirer. Yet Christ Himself carefully avoided imposing His teaching from above; He bade those men observe accessible facts, think these facts over honestly for themselves, and come to their own conclusion. Those men were, in Tertullian's sense, priests at that moment, and three of them made a Church. Again, one of the most serious questions in all Christian history has been that of heretical baptism. Scarcely anybody doubted that all unbaptized folk must go to hell; yet here were thousands and tens of thousands who, according to one party, had not even taken the first step away from hell unless they had been baptized or rebaptized by persons of whom the majority approved. St. Cyprian, with other distinguished bishops of his day, was certain that a person baptized by a heretic was not baptized at all; the then Bishop of Rome thought otherwise. There was no universally recognized judge between those two antagonists; they used bitter words towards each

other; but neither convinced the other, and this conflict of opinion lasted a century and a half. The final decision came through no exercise of recognized authority, but by the greater persuasiveness of another bishop, St. Augustine. To give a third instance, there has been an even greater lack of decisive teaching on another question of supreme importance, that of the inspired Scriptures. The plenary and literal inspiration of the Bible was held by the orthodox of the Middle Ages as definitely as by the Low Churchmen of a century ago. St. Thomas Aquinas insists upon Biblical inerrancy even in small historical details; he gives a concrete instance to explain his position; if (he says) we deny that Samuel was the son of Elkanah, then we are heretics. Here, then, is a unique and inerrant volume, absolutely distinguished from all other volumes in the world; yet the Church is unable exactly to decide what are the contents of that volume. We are heretics if we question Samuel's parentage; but must we go to hell for disbelieving in the legend of Tobit? The so-called 'Apocryphal Books' were rejected by St. Jerome in about 400 A.D.; it was only eleven centuries later, by a decision which claimed to be final, that the Council of Trent decreed the inerrancy of these books excluded by Jerome, while the other half of Christendom decided otherwise; and this question of the Apocrypha is no more settled at the present day than it was fifteen centuries ago. When, therefore, men talk of the Church's decision on purely religious questions as final, what do they really mean? Here, at the present moment, is a question on which many folk are setting up the claims of the Church against those of the State, this question of the Deposited Book. A majority of the bishops, we are told, want it; representatives of priests and lay folk have voted in majority for it; therefore (it is argued), on this purely religious question, these religious majorities must be right. Yet who is to assure us that what is here called the Church will not change her mind on this subject in 150 years' time (as on heretical baptism) or eleven centuries hence (as on the Bible question)? A Roman Catholic stands in a clear and comprehensible position; if the Pope tells him to resist the State on this question or on that, his duty is quite definite; he must obey the Pope. An Anglo-Catholic would be equally clear, if only he could make up his mind where to find

this teaching Church which he bids us obey. Does it, for instance, reside in the Bishops?—but even the Anglican bishops seldom agree with each other, let alone with their brethren the Roman bishops. Or does it reside in a General Council of Christendom?—but such a Council is never held, now; and, if held, it would provoke differences even more violent than those within the present Anglican Church.

Let us, therefore, again consult the facts of history. The definite beginning of this conflict between Church and State comes in the early fourth century, when Constantine made Christianity the State Church of the Roman Empire. The Church had already organized itself in imitation of the imperial bureaucracy; quite as definitely, for instance, as the Salvation Army models itself upon our field army. It was therefore not only a spiritual body, but also a political body, with which emperors could ally themselves; and the early Christian emperors sealed this alliance, as the Reformation in later centuries sealed similar alliances, by enriching the favoured denomination with the plunder of temples, by condemning the older worship as illegal, and by supporting the main body of Christians in their legislation against Nonconformists within their own body. Theodosius I went so far as to decree death, in extreme cases, against certain heretics. At the first Christian world-council, which has given us the Nicene Creed, Constantine tried every art of political persuasion to coerce the bishops who formed the minority; only two held out stubbornly to the end, and those two he punished for their disobedience by sending them into exile. Like many politicians at the present moment, he was mainly concerned for unity; this Church quarrel *must* be settled one way or another, for political reasons, since the continuation of conflict in the Church would mean unsettlement for the State. Therefore, though he was himself rather inclined towards the minority of the bishops, he condemned them as a politician while sympathizing with their theology. Nor did this imperial influence seem, in those days, to sap the foundations of religion. St. Athanasius himself appealed to the Emperor for his decision. The Donatists, after appealing to Constantine and getting an adverse decision, repudiated his authority; but then the Catholic champion, Bishop Optatus of Milevi, wrote: 'The State is not

in the Church, but the Church is in the State, that is, in the Roman Empire . . . Since God alone sits above the Emperor . . . Donatus is now presuming to behave not as a man but rather almost as a God, in that he despises that person to whom, next to God, men pay the greatest honour.' The great German jurist Friedberg says truly: 'The Emperor's competence [to judge] was set at nought only by the party against whom he judged.' 'True, the decision was generally left to a Church Synod. Yet such synods were never convened but at the Emperor's summons; the Emperor opened their proceedings; his commissioners superintended them; and their decrees were confirmed by the Emperor.' Therefore, naturally, the Church officials tended more and more to be considered as State officials; on the one hand, a bishop like Athanasius would call upon the Emperor for protection; on the other, some bishop might be deposed by the Emperor without consulting any synod. Moreover, in official language Constantine called himself 'King and Priest,' 'Victor in battle and Teacher of the Faith.' And a century later, in 448, the fathers assembled at the synod of Constantinople greeted an imperial decree with the cry, 'Long live the royal high-priest!'

Moreover, this language represented actual facts. The Church in Tertullian's sense, the almost intangible Quaker Church, might have successfully asserted itself against the State; but how could a State Church rise up, in those days, against the State which had so recently done so much to create it? The Church hierarchy had been, and still was, organized on the model of the State bureaucracy; Church ceremonies and vestments were often borrowed from State ceremonies and vestments; it was State soldiers and State police that had disestablished and disendowed the older temples in favour of this newer Church. Therefore even a Pope like St. Gregory the Great, nearly three centuries after Constantine, confessed his subjection to the State in important respects. The Emperor Maurice had decreed that no soldier might become a monk without first getting his regular discharge from the army: and he sent this decree to Gregory with orders to publish it in his churches. Gregory objected to it strongly on religious grounds, but his independence went no farther than to remonstrate with the Emperor and his Council.

'What am I, that speak to my lords, but dust and a worm . . . your unworthy servant . . . Being subject to your commands, I have sent your law round from land to land; yet, because the law is at plain discord with God Almighty, behold! I have laid this my letter of protest before your most serene lordships. Therefore I have done my duty on both sides, paying obedience to the Emperor, but speaking plainly my own feelings for God's sake.'[3]

Time would fail me to give anything but the briefest details beyond this period. When the Empire was revived under Charles the Great, he took something very like Constantine's attitude towards the clergy; he treated them as State officials. That addition to the Nicene Creed which did so much to separate the Western Church from the East, the so-called *Filioque Clause*, was adopted in our churches through Charles's influence and against papal advice. On the fundamental Church question of image-worship, he again took a line of disagreement with the Pope; and, presiding at the great synod at Frankfort, he ratified decrees which practically called upon the Pope to abandon his own view on this theological point. 'Let us have statues and paintings in our churches,' he said, 'but not *adore* them; let us have not only saints represented, but all kinds of great men.' How, then, did the Popes ever advance from this to the position indicated by Innocent III and Boniface VIII? Briefly, the explanation is to be found in medieval eschatology, which for many centuries became more and more lurid. It was assumed as a commonplace that the dying man's last moments decided for him between an eternity of bliss and an eternity of horrors beyond all imagination; horrors constantly described by priests to their flocks with all the force of language, and all the ingenuity of metaphor or simile, that lay at their disposal. The mission-preacher, Berthold of Regensburg, whom Roger Bacon names as the greatest of his own day, told his hearers to imagine themselves white-hot in a white-hot universe, to think of these tortures lasting as many years as all the hairs that have grown on all the beasts that have lived on this earth since the Creation, and to remember that this would be only the beginning of their pains, a mere drop in the ocean of eternity. A man's last moment of life, then, was all-decisive; and at that last moment the decisive question was: Is he right with the Catholic Church? Therefore priestly excommunication was more to be feared than any other thing upon earth; and a Pope like Gregory VII could say with

[3] *Epp.* lib. III, p. 65.

perfect logic: 'Seeing that God has given me power of binding or loosing even over emperors, where heaven and hell are concerned, how then can it be doubted that my power exceeds the emperor's in the civil sphere also?' Yet when this theory was clearly proclaimed, it was not always accepted even by the most orthodox ecclesiastics. The monk Hugh of Fleury, writing about 1120 A.D., sets himself definitely to combat those who derive the royal power not from God, but from mere human convenience.[4] He quotes the well-known sentence of Gregory VII, to the effect that worldly kingdoms and principalities were notoriously founded not by God, but by the devil; yet he quotes this only to refute it, adding: 'How frivolous that opinion is, we may see clearly from the apostle's words, *For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God.*'

Later on, remarkable thinkers like Marsilius of Padua and William of Ockham argued the question boldly and scientifically, supplying historical and practical reasons for the subordination of Church to State. The one rule of faith is the Bible; this is to be interpreted not by the Pope, but by a General Council representing all Christendom; and (adds Ockham) even women may sit on such a Council. But these, with a few more, remained isolated protests until the Reformation. Let me conclude, therefore, with a few sentences translated from a distinguished German Church historian, Hundeshagen, sentences which the learned Catholic, Lord Acton, has marked with his approving pencil in the copy now belonging to Cambridge University Library. 'Only through Protestantism,' writes Hundeshagen, 'did it become a fixed axiom of the age that the worldly authority comes *directly from God*, not through Papal mediation; and that it possesses from God an *independent* power, not subordinated to the Pope. Hereby was the conception of the State raised from its abasement; and Luther was able with real reason to boast, as in fact he did often enough, of his achievement in this direction' (the italics are his). Zwingli and Calvin followed suit.[5]

In this, therefore, as in a good many other matters, the Reformation did bring the world back to something more nearly resembling the earliest and purest Christian conditions.

[4] Baluze. Misc. lib. IV, p. 2: *de regia potestate.*

[5] K. B. Hundeshagen, *Kleinere Schriften* (Gotha, 1875), Vol. II, p. 493.

JESUS AND CONTEMPORARY JUDAISM*

By the Rev. V. J. K. Brook, M.A., Fellow and Chaplain of Lincoln College, Oxford.

WHAT I wish to do is simply this—to gather together those sayings of Jesus which we usually regard in isolation, so as to gain a general view of His attitude to Judaism. It may be that from His criticism of contemporary belief and practice we may learn what was His conception of religion—of the nature of God and of man's proper way of approach to God. I am sure that such a method of dealing with the teaching of Christ is entirely justifiable, and should be free from attack either from the side of the extreme eschatological school, or from that of the modern Jewish champion of his ancestors. Even if, with Schweitzer, we are to grant that the moral teaching of Christ is a mere temporary ethic of which it is impossible to make a code for everyday use, yet even Schweitzer does not, I fancy, suppose that Christ's controversial remarks were coloured by His Messianic self-consciousness. His criticisms of Jewish thought and practice do not suggest that He thought them wrong because the Kingdom was at hand, but that simply and in themselves they seemed to Him wrong, intrinsically,—and from His remarks therefore we can deduce what seemed to Him intrinsically right. Nor is the validity of this method of approach impaired by the criticisms of modern Jewish apologists. They have been at pains to show that on the one hand a great deal of what we regard as central in the teaching of Christ was not in fact original in Him, but that it was part of the common Jewish belief and is to be found in Rabbinic writings; and that, on the other hand, so far as He did criticize contemporary Judaism, He was unfair to it and misrepresented it. But there again, for our present purpose, neither of those things matters. Our main interest is not in contemporary Judaism, but in Jesus' conception of religion. When therefore He criticizes a belief, or a practice, that criticism may be expected to reveal His point of view, even though the belief was held by no Jew in His day, nor the practice followed.

* This paper was originally written to be read aloud, and it has not been possible to re-write it for publication.

Of course — though this is incidental — it would materially affect our attitude towards Jesus if it could be shown that He did, for polemical reasons, really misrepresent the Pharisees and contemporary Jewish religion as a whole. But that I think has not been shown. No doubt parallels to some of His highest sayings may be found in Jewish writers (though very often those quoted come from Rabbis of a later date). But still, even granted that they are to be found in Jewish writers, that does not lessen the striking significance of the fact that it is not as taught by the Rabbis but as taught by Christ that they have become widespread. It is His inspiration, His person, His authority that have given them weight. But if it is sought to show that Jesus was only a preacher of Judaism, and that where He differed, His criticisms of it were really unjust, then I think there is one simple fact which we must stress, for it is fatal to such views—I mean of course the unwavering hostility to Jesus of practically all in His day who could claim authoritatively to represent Judaism. That opposition, I am sure, was not due to the fact that He claimed to be the Messiah, for the opposition started before that claim was generally known. It can only have been due to a feeling that His teaching was not orthodox Judaism; that somehow He was different, although some of His teaching could be supported from the prophets. And I think the only natural way in which to explain their *extreme* hostility is to suppose that there really was something in His criticism of them. If His charges had been patently and manifestly untrue, they could have been ignored: it is I think quite impossible to explain their hatred except on the supposition that His criticism had at least sufficient foundation to appear plausible and to convince the multitude who heard Him gladly.

For that digression I must crave pardon; but I do not wish to leave the impression that I believe that it has been shown that the teaching of Christ was a mere replica of Jewish teaching and that in so far as He departed from and attacked Judaism His attacks were unfounded. But I must repeat—that is not our main business: what we really wish to discuss is our Lord's conception of religion. And first, I think, we shall do well to look at religion as He found it.

Plainly, in idea, the centre of the whole of Judaism was the *Temple*. Of course, in fact, for a great many Jews, especially

of the Dispersion, worship in the Temple was not a practical possibility as a rule. But there can be no doubt that religious interest centred in it, and in the sacrifices there offered on behalf of the people. This interest was kept alive by the payment, even by Jews not in Jerusalem, of the Temple tax, which would make a man feel that he really was practically sharing in the Temple worship; and of course those who could do so would make pilgrimages to Jerusalem. For example, in St. Luke when Zacharias went to Jerusalem 'in the order of his course' to execute the priest's office, though his home was apparently a city of Judah in the hill country (i, 39), yet the people who were waiting for him to come out from sacrificing at any rate *look* as though they were a group of friends who had gone up with him. Certainly, if they were so, they would simply have been conforming to the usual custom, according to Dr. Abrahams. For it was usual for local delegacies, he says, to accompany a priest from the country when it was his turn to serve in Jerusalem, while the congregation at home would, so to speak, be with him in sympathy and spirit, and would mark the hour of the Temple sacrifice by a public reading of the Law. That is to say, the Temple is really central in the thought of the time, though often it was actually out of reach. Of the Temple worship, the central feature was sacrifice, and the pre-eminence of the Temple in Jewish thought was partly at least due to the fact that there alone might sacrifice be offered. What was the origin of sacrifice is, as is well known, a subject of dispute; but at least, in our Lord's day, the idea underlying it was simply that of offering a gift to God—it might be as a sign of thanksgiving, or to win His favour or to avert His wrath (so Oesterley and Box). But, whatever the motive of sacrifice, sacrifice was the central feature of the worship in the Temple to which all Jews looked.

It is important to emphasize that. For the Jews of the Dispersion, neither Temple nor sacrifice was usually possible. They had to devise a means of getting on without them, and historically, no doubt, it was this fact which really enabled Judaism to survive the destruction of the Temple. But the fact that later Judaism existed without the Temple must not lead us into supposing that in our Lord's time the Judaism of Galilee had, so to speak, become independent of the Temple, merely ethical. The background of it all—the inner core—was the sacrifices at

Jerusalem for the whole nation. But as a substitute or supplement for those who could not go to the Temple, synagogue worship had been developed. This was apparently a not very formal proceeding. There was reading from the Old Testament, and exposition of it: but the exposition was not necessarily given by an official (*e.g.* Jesus in the synagogue at Nazareth); apparently considerable freedom of treatment was allowed; and prayer, according to Abrahams, was not prescribed, but was a 'free emotion.' Thus there was considerable latitude here, though when Abrahams stresses the fact that there is no evidence that Jesus was ever forbidden to preach in the synagogues, it is at least worth remembering that at Nazareth His hearers did wish for His teaching to throw Him from the top of the hill (*Luke* iv, 29). There were evidently practical limits, even if not official limits, to the freedom of speech! Still, the synagogue worship, which was all that the typical non-Jerusalem Jew had, does seem to have been very unceremonial and fluid, with free prayer, instruction, and perhaps discussion. As Prof. Toy says: 'here was the minimum of form; the sacerdotal element was excluded: the essence of the worship was the individual appropriation of the divine word.'

Side by side with this public worship there was an immense stress on the *keeping of the Law*, mainly as yet the Pentateuch, though already some authoritative interpretations or 'traditions' were recognized. From the time of the exile onwards more and more of those who could not attend Temple worship tended to express their Judaism by increased devotion and respect for the Law. It was not regarded as an affliction or burden, but as a blessing, a sign of God's care and goodwill to Israel—it was still so, even to St. Paul, in his Christian days. And the Law was not entirely ceremonial. There *was* a great deal of ritual, of course, besides that which had regard to sacrifice—rules for observance of Sabbath and Circumcision, rules of fasting, rules of ritual cleanness. But there is beside that in the Pentateuch much high moral teaching—about kindliness and sexual purity and right dealing. In fact, the Jew who lived up to the ethical teaching of the Law must have been a very much better man than the average Gentile. It was no slight gain that it should be regarded as a real part of Judaism that a man should keep the Law. Moreover, some at least of the teachers and interpreters of

the Law did maintain a very high and liberal standard of morality, notably Hillel, whose ethical conceptions, says Toy, are 'marked by freedom, breadth and genialness.'

But when that has been said it must, I think, in fairness be added that not all Jews escaped from the dangers of a legalistic conception of man's relations to God. The observance of the Law was an *absolute* necessity. The great men might rise above mere outward observance to the inner righteousness for which Jeremiah yearned. But many were satisfied simply to fulfil the commandments in outward deed. Sin, in such circumstances, is not an inward condition but a breach of a definite precept. Attention is concentrated therefore more on precept than on the inner spiritual condition, and religion tends to become a mere mechanical affair. Moreover, as the Law contained ritual as well as moral enactments, they were both put on the same level (our habit of separating the two was unknown to Jews of Christ's day, even to St. Paul, and to the latter the Law stood or fell as a whole). That inevitably tends to the stressing of ritual laws which are easier to fulfil—at the expense of ethical which are harder. Finally, immense reverence for the Law does inevitably tend to put men in a purely legal relation to God: the Law becomes as it were an intermediary between God and man, and religion is not a direct relation between God and man, but obedience to a code.

Those are some of the dangers of legalism, and I personally have little doubt that some of the Jews were entrapped by them; but there was a real belief in prayer, and many of the Psalms, for example, are classical expressions of spiritual as distinct from legalistic religion. Moreover, though sin is primarily an offence against the Torah, yet the mere outward offering of sacrifice was not enough for its atonement: repentance also was demanded, and sacrifice itself was probably always regarded, says Toy, as 'the organized expression of the consciousness of sin.'

Perhaps, in summary, it might be said that the emphasis on the Law had dangers—of ceremonialism and of a legalistic conception of God: that in some cases (*e.g.* in the Pharisees) these dangers were realised in a mechanical conception of religious duties and an undue insistence on ceremonial. On the other hand, the ethical standards of the Law are high, and did lead in fact to a generally high standard of life, while there are many

evidences that some at least of the Jews rose far above a merely legalistic religion.

Of their idea of *God* it is difficult to speak with any certainty, for there are so many views to be found in such literature as we have. The following remarks may only be regarded as very generally true. Clearly, however, God was thought of as personal and of awful might: He rewarded virtue and punished iniquity, as laid down in the Law. But he pardoned the repentant, and cared for and loved Israel. So far I am summarizing what Dr. Montefiore says. Plainly there is a legal aspect there: God is the ruler and judge who administers His Law. Evil is punished and, generally speaking, suffering seems to be regarded either as punishment from God for sin, or as chastisement to prevent further sin. The idea of a coming judgment is prominent almost throughout, and is usually connected somehow with the coming of the Messiah.

But side by side with that emphasis on the stern and righteous aspect of God, there is also to be found great stress on His mercy and loving-kindness. He does forgive those who are penitent; even the giving of the Law was an act of mercy—it was to save Israel from going astray and so from punishment. Sometimes God is even spoken of as Father, but Professor Toy thinks that such a conception was confined to a select circle, and was not widely held in current Jewish thought at the time of Christ. But still, for all His sternness, God is frequently spoken of as merciful—He forgives the penitent and helps the Israelite. But there is not at all the same general agreement that He is merciful to the non-Jews. There are writers who represent Him as having a kindly purpose even towards them: but on the whole the Gentiles are regarded as the objects of His justice rather than His mercy: sometimes, even, He is represented definitely as taking vengeance on them for the Israelites. Thus, primarily God is thought of as the righteous Judge, but one who is favourably inclined to Israel. Comparatively few regard His mercy as extended to all men: as a rule, He has no kindness for the Gentile nor for the unrepentant sinner, but only punishment.

Such, roughly, was Judaism as our Lord found it. What was His attitude towards it? In the remarks which follow, I propose deliberately to confine myself to the Synoptic account. I

personally do not doubt that there were visits to Jerusalem not recorded by the Synoptists, but I do not wish to use Johannine material which might be regarded as not entirely historical.

According to the Synoptists, practically the whole of the ministerial life of Jesus was spent outside Jerusalem. That is to say, the form of Jewish worship with which He would be most familiar would be the synagogue type. And, so far as I know, we have no record of any criticism by Him of that—a form of service, let me remind you, of spontaneous prayer, Scripture reading and instruction. So far from criticizing this, Christ seems to have regarded it as a basis on which He could build. We constantly hear of Him going to the synagogue and teaching there, and Luke (iv, 16) definitely says it was His custom. Later on, it is true, He seems rather to have chosen to teach the crowds in the open or in a private house. But I do not think that implies a criticism of the synagogue type of worship. It is probably due to the fact that the atmosphere there was unsympathetic rather than to any disapproval of the method.

Further, Jerusalem, the city of the prophets, seems to have held a large place in His thoughts as in those of most contemporary Jews. His lament over the city shows how greatly He would have valued the support of Jerusalem, and He set His face to go and preach there, though He knew it would mean His death. It has been suggested, on the basis of *Luke* xiii, 33, '*It is not possible that a prophet should die outside Jerusalem*,' that His object in going there at the end was not to preach but to provoke His death. I cannot believe that the context supports such an interpretation. He is pointing out that He has no fear of Herod's threats as He is to work to-day and to-morrow and on the third day to be perfected. Then comes the saying about Jerusalem. And all it means, so far as I can see, is that the end will not come until He has finished His ministry and that that includes teaching in Jerusalem, which will culminate in His death. Thus, I think, it is clear that to Him, as to other provincial Jews, though His usual worship was in the synagogue, yet Jerusalem did appeal to the imagination very forcibly as the Holy City.

But when we turn to consider His attitude to the Temple and the sacrifices there offered, at once there is to be noticed a change. Christ, of course, did go to the Temple, but there is

no evidence that He ever in any way identified Himself with the sacrifices, which to the ordinary Jew were the central glory of the Temple, nor is there any occasion, save two, on which He commands those who heard Him to offer sacrifice. On one occasion, a leper who was healed was told to offer the gifts commanded by Moses (all three Synoptists)—but that does not carry us very far, since that was a mere part of the formality by which a leper was pronounced clean by the priests. Practically then, all we have is not a commendation of the sacrificial system, but a way of proving that the healing of the leper is complete by his submission to the priest for examination. In other cases of healing, no such command is recorded. The other case in which sacrifice appears at least to be allowed is *Mt.* v, 23, where the offering of a gift at the altar is definitely put in a place of secondary importance as compared with becoming reconciled to thy brother. Plainly, the point of view there is that of one to whom sacrifice is not of primary importance. That such was the attitude of Christ throughout is borne out by other positive evidence. According to Matthew (ix, 13) He quotes with approval Hosea's saying, 'I desire mercy and not sacrifice'; when a scribe declares (*Mark* xii, 33) that to love God with all the heart, and one's neighbour as oneself is 'more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices,' Jesus, for His discreet answer, replies, 'Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God.' In the Temple, the most striking event is the cleansing. Dr. Abrahams agrees with most modern commentators that the traders were there to supply unblemished animals for sacrifice and the particular currency in which alone the Temple tribute could be paid. From the Jewish point of view that is, no doubt, an adequate defence of their presence in the Temple—but it makes the conduct of Christ all the more striking : although their trade was essential to the offering of ritually pure sacrifice, He will have none of it. God's House is to be primarily a House of Prayer (not of sacrifice). And it is entirely in accord with this view that, so far as we have any picture of Christ in the Temple, whether as a lad or later on, He seems to regard it as a place for prayer and instruction. In other words, while to other Jews the synagogue was a substitute for the Temple, for Christ the synagogue seems to have been preferable, and He seems to have

valued the Temple rather for the opportunities it gave of following synagogue methods. In other words, there is nothing in His attitude to Judaism here to suggest that He had any use for a ritual and sacrificial approach to God : rather He preferred simple prayer and instruction. I think that is significant.

To make this quite complete, I should add that Matthew does represent Him as paying the didrachma or Temple tax—but he carefully explains that it is so as not to cause offence (*Matt.* xvii, 27). He is, too, represented as taking the Passover meal with His disciples—(if it really *was* the Passover meal). But I do not believe that one can build on that very greatly. It is fairly plain that what He valued about it was not so much the sacrifice as the intimate and homely atmosphere which belongs to the family celebration of the Passover—an atmosphere of love for which He yearned, but which was usually denied Him.

The keeping of the Law was, as I have said, one of the chief glories and privileges to the Jew of our Lord's day—but it is, to my mind, not very easy to discover our Lord's attitude towards it. There are several places in which He speaks highly of it and seems to regard it as of lasting importance. '*Think not that I come to destroy the Law or the prophets . . . till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the Law, till all things be accomplished*' (*Matt.* v, 17) (Cp. *Luke* xvi, 17) '*It is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one tittle of the Law to fall*'—which looks as though it had been in Q—and Luke does not seem here to suggest as does Matthew that there is to come a time when it shall no longer be binding. And yet, in the preceding verse that is precisely what he has done—'*the Law and the prophets were until John*,' which Matthew also gives in another context. I think if we had only those sayings, we should have to say that while Christ spoke highly of the Law, yet He regarded its validity as not eternal : Q represents it rather as ending with the coming of the Baptist—*i.e.* the re-opening of prophecy; whereas Matthew seems to regard it as valid until the Second Coming—*cp.* the saying (only in *Matt.* xxiii, 3), '*All things therefore whatsoever they bid you, these do and observe.*'

But I think we can get even deeper into an understanding of our Lord's attitude. In *Matt.* vii, 12, '*All things whatsoever*

ye would that men should do unto you even so do ye also unto them,' is stated to *be* the Law and the prophets. In other words, that is the fundamental principle: the Mosaic code is valuable in so far as in detail it gives expression to that principle, and leads men to the apprehension of it. Where it leads to the neglect of the fundamental principle, there it is to be amended—as Christ Himself does amend certain of its commandments in the Sermon on the Mount (*Matt.* v, 21-29) exactly on those principles. Exactly the same is His attitude to the Sabbath. In *Deuteronomy* there is about the Sabbath commandment a feeling of humanitarianism, '*That thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou. And thou shalt remember that thou wast a servant in the Land of Egypt*' (*Dt.* v, 14). So far, and only so far, as the Sabbath observance expresses that spirit does He commend it—the Sabbath was made for man. And here, perhaps, I ought to say that there were different opinions among the Jews as to Sabbath observance: some did feel that help to an animal in difficulties was legitimate on the Sabbath, others did not. Christ definitely approves the attitude of the former, and uses it as being on a par with His own breaking of the ritual rule of the Sabbath in order to observe its deeper humanitarian motive.

There was also (as Abrahams points out) division among Jews on another point connected with the Law—how far a Jew might mix with sinners. There were sayings in favour of helping the poor (who would, many of them, be ritually unclean) and even injunctions to entertain and support them. But, although one might, from such motives, entertain them in one's own house, there were few who would associate with them outside it, or go to houses where they were likely to be met, though some apparently even did this. In this matter also Jesus took the side of the more liberal-minded: the real point of the criticism of His conduct is just this, that He associated with them under circumstances in which He could not plead that He was Himself giving them material charity which the Law would recognize as an excuse. Of course, all again that He wanted to do was to carry out logically that love of one's fellow-men which underlay the commandment to give to the poor. It was the spirit that He valued. Such was His attitude to the Law. But he did also

emphasize the value of the Law as leading to that spirit—He found in fact that it was really doing so in the case of the more liberal-minded Jews (cf. *Luke* x, 26, where it is the lawyer, not Christ, who gives the two commandments as summing up the Law). Hence the saying of Abraham to the rich man in the parable of Lazarus, 'They have Moses and the prophets,' which plainly means that the Law and the prophets *can* lead a man to the right frame of mind. But only so far as it does so is the Law of value; it is not simply to be literally fulfilled—it is not wide enough: the old bottles will not contain the new wine.

Naturally, therefore, it is no surprise to find that, when Jesus deals with the merely ritual Laws, He is more severe. The outward washings are only of value in so far as they symbolize and keep before a man's eye the inner cleanness which should be his: fasting is of no value except as the expression of real sorrow—'in the days when the bridegroom is taken from them, then shall they fast, in those days.' In *Matt.* ix, 29, the true reading is apparently, 'This sort cometh not out save by prayer' ('and fasting' should be omitted). The mere ritualism of the Pharisees is freely condemned.

If one may sum up, what the evidence seems to suggest is this. What Christ really wanted was the fundamental things—love of God and love of one's neighbour. In so far as the Law did emphasize that a man was not simply an isolated being, but had a duty to God and his fellows; in so far as it helped men to realize those obligations, it was good. But in so far as it suggested that a man's duty was simply the observance of set ordinances—whether moral or ritual—it needed correction, and was, indeed, superseded by the new spirit inaugurated by the coming of the Baptist. In what Christ says about the Law, there is not, I think, any justification for a legalistic religion, a religion which emphasizes the observance of fixed rules. Rather the rules will vary with different circumstances. God is not the formulator of a code; all He asks is that men's lives should be guided by love—which is really a harder thing, though it gives to God Himself a less severe aspect, and lessens the conception of Him as Lawgiver. Christ's teaching suggests that the rigid conception of Divine Law had really served a purpose, but that now it was time for men to pass beyond it.

So far, then, Christ plainly does not put forward a system which would promote the idea of God as judge, administering a fixed code. Such was at any rate to many Jews—though by no means all—the most prominent aspect of God's nature. It was His righteousness which was most emphasized. In the teaching of Jesus it is always the *Fatherhood* of God which is put forward. I am quite sure that it was as Father that He wished us to think of God, not as judge. It has been urged that, to His hearers, the most obvious quality of Fatherhood would be authority. But I do not believe that it was authority which Jesus wished to stress, but simply loving care—though a care, of course, which for all its love was not foolish or indulgent. God is never called 'judge,' He is never described as 'righteous.' In St. Matthew '*Be ye perfect even as your heavenly Father is perfect*' (v. 48), is used in a way which suggests that the perfection of God is to be found not in His justice but in His mercy—and in fact the parallel passage in Luke so puts it, 'Be ye therefore merciful even as your Father is merciful.' Normally God is referred to simply as Father or Heavenly Father, one who showers blessings on the just and the unjust, and gives good gifts to men far more readily than they do to each other. Men are to hope for the Kingdom not as a just reward for their merits, but because it is the Father's good pleasure to give it (*Luke* xii, 32). God is One who gives from love of giving, not merely to reward, as the man who gave more than they had earned to the labourers in his vineyard (*Matt.* xx, 1). Even in the Synoptics (to say nothing of the better known case in *St. John*) the idea that a great sufferer is a great sinner meeting punishment (though sometimes, I admit, passed over without comment) is on one occasion definitely rejected—*Luke* xiii, 2: 'Think ye that these Galilaeans were sinners above all Galilaeans because they have suffered these things? I tell you Nay . . . or those eighteen upon whom the tower of Siloam fell, and killed them, think ye that they were offenders above all the men that dwell in Jerusalem? I tell you Nay.' Even where the connection between sin and suffering seems to be allowed, a close examination shows that it is not necessarily so. 'That ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins—then saith He to the sick of the palsy, Arise.' Surely His real point there is that the

forgiveness of sins is not such a mysterious transaction as they supposed.

Always, it is God's love that is emphasized in such sayings, never His righteousness; and that love is always ready to express itself in forgiveness as soon as there is real repentance—*e.g.*, the Pharisee and the Publican. Of this repentance real love is simply another aspect—*cf.* the woman whose sins were forgiven because she loved much, and the constant emphasis on our forgiving others if we would be forgiven. As soon as a man is in that state of repentance, or love, he is forgiven. There is no suggestion of any real need of a transaction, or of outward penance. In the Jewish system, as I have said, sacrifice was largely insisted on as well as, or even as an expression of, repentance: Jesus does not appear to suggest that: there is no need of a gift to God or of a 'discipline'—repentance alone suffices.

It seems to me that all that points to one conclusion—that one of the primary objects of Jesus' teaching, as contrasted with Jewish, was to make men think of God as Father first of all—and as a Father whose goodness is not limited by strict legal limits, but only by the wisdom of a Father who is all-knowing. But is the Jewish idea of God as the administrator of justice, as righteous, as the avenger of the down-trodden but holy, completely omitted? That raises a very difficult point, with a consideration of which I propose to end this paper. There is in all three Synoptic Gospels, a clearly expressed teaching that there is to be a judgment. That, too, was the belief of Judaism. But, as I said before, there was among the Jews no consensus of opinion as to who was to be judge—whether God or the Messiah—or as to when the judgment was to be—whether before or after the Millennium. Now it is significant that even in the three Gospels, there is also no clearly drawn picture of the judgment. So far I have simply accepted the Synoptic record as it stands, without question as to what effect the tendencies of the various writers may have had on their records: I did not wish to appear to be brushing aside this or that saying on purely subjective or even on textual grounds. But when we come to the subject of the judgment, I think we are bound to end in a condition of entire confusion unless we remember what Canon Streeter has, I think, proved beyond doubt, that we can definitely

trace through the Gospels in their succession a tendency to increase the apocalyptic element in our Lord's teaching, and that this tendency reaches its highest point in St. Matthew. It is only, I think, on the assumption that some such process has been at work that we can at all understand the evidence the Gospels give. There is really as much confusion in them as in current Jewish thought. I am tempted to believe that the confusion came from Jewish ideas in the minds of the writers rather than from Jesus Himself.

On the whole the general idea seems to be that there will be a day of judgment when all shall together be judged (*Matt.* x, 15; *Matt.* xi, 22; *Luke* xiv, 14; xvii, 22). And yet there are passages which suggest that judgment is immediate after death; *e.g.* Lazarus and Dives are already respectively in bliss and torment, and the repentant thief is to be in Paradise at once. And, if they stood alone, such sayings as 'it is better to enter into life maimed than having two hands to depart into Gehenna,' would most naturally suggest immediate judgment. There are parallels to such an idea in Jewish writings, *e.g.* in the book of Enoch, in the Dream Visions. But, in the main, the judgment is conceived (as in Jewish literature in the main) as a great Assize. But who is, so to speak, to deliver sentence? In one saying, which appears to be Q, it is the Twelve, sitting on twelve thrones. In the parable of the Tares, it is the Son of Man who is to administer through His angels (*Matt.* xiii, 41), and sinners are to go to a place where is 'lamentation and gnashing of teeth,' a phrase which occurs some seven times in *Matt.* and only once elsewhere. In *Matt.* xvi, 27, again, it is the Son of Man who is to render to each according to his works (though there is no mention of judgment, but only of the parousia in the Marcan passage on which this is based). In *Luke* xii, 46, again, in the parable of the drunken steward, it is the Master who returns—*i.e.* apparently Christ—who is to administer judgment, and it is the same in Luke's parable of the Pounds, where it is the king who has returned in possession of his kingdom who issues the order to 'slay mine enemies' (*Luke* xix, 27). So also in the parables of the Virgins, and the Wedding Garment, and the Sheep and the Goats, it is the Son of Man.

On the other hand, there are passages in which it is appar-

ently God who is to be the Judge; but they are far fewer—*e.g.* 'Everyone who confesseth me before men, him will I confess before my Father in heaven' (*Matt.* x, 32)—here the Lucan version is 'I will confess him before the angels of God' (*Luke* xii, 4), which is a Jewish way of saying 'God.' So again, in *Matt.* xviii, 35, 'So shall my heavenly Father do unto you if ye forgive not every man his brother.' Again in *Luke* xii, 5, 'Fear him that hath power to cast into Gehenna,' must, I think, refer to God, and there is the definite phrase in *Luke* xviii, 7, 'Shall not God avenge His elect that cry unto Him day and night?' if that really is a reference to the judgment. But I think it is rather meant to emphasize God's protection of His own.

Though this may be rather wearisome, it is important with a view to finding out our Lord's teaching about God. I personally believe that what it shows is the extent to which Jewish thought has coloured the Synoptic account of the judgment. But if it is taken together and the most frequently expressed view is regarded as being the teaching of Christ, it is plain that it is entirely opposed to the view that has usually been held. So far from the Father being the stern judge before whom Christ pleads for us His sacrifice, the Father usually does not come in: it is Christ Himself who administers justice! But if it is Christ, then surely we may not believe that even in the judgment it will be even-handed justice which predominates: it will be mercy: and the mediaeval idea of Christ or anyone else pleading the merits of Christ on our behalf must go.

In view of such evidence, any teaching as to Christ's views of the judgment must, I feel, be conjectural. That He insisted that there would be a judgment I feel sure; but whether He meant more than that men would be so treated as would be best calculated to make them good I very much doubt. That He taught, in our sense of the word 'eternal,' a doctrine of everlasting punishment I think is simply untrue. As is well known, the word 'aionios' invariably means, not eternal, but lasting through a whole temporal stage. In Mark, the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is only said not to have forgiveness 'for the age': it is Matthew who adds 'nor in the age to come,' and Luke who hardens it into the absolute statement 'shall not be forgiven.' But there is nothing contrary to the belief in the supreme

and all-controlling love of God and of Christ in supposing that men will be treated differently according as their condition calls for different treatment. That is the natural outcome of true fatherhood, but not of judgeship, as we think of judges with the human example in our mind. So far as I remember, there are two, but only two passages which really suggest a judgment in the sense of a divine vengeance—that in Q (*Luke* xi, 50) where the blood of prophets slain in the past is to be demanded of the Jews of our Lord's day, and the Lucan ending to the parable of the Pounds—'Slay mine enemies.' But those two sayings are a very slight foundation on which to base a doctrine of divine vengeance as against a doctrine of divine discipline for the amendment of those who are sinners—a discipline which is the expression, not the contradiction, of saving love. That I believe to have been Christ's doctrine of judgment (as against the Jews), and there are positive sayings in support of it. Plainly the meaning of 'by what judgment ye judge ye shall be judged' is that there is no fixed criterion, but that a man is judged, as we say, 'according to his lights.' And in many places, the judgment is represented as being the reward of those who are fit for rewards, while the others are not punished but simply left out. In *Luke* xii, 25, the householder simply shuts out the unworthy; in xvii, 22, one is to be taken, the other simply left; the foolish virgins are excluded; so are the unwilling wedding guests. Even in the parable of the Sheep and the Goats, what we have is not an administration of justice on legal lines. The conduct of sheep and goats has been different; but that is a mere indication of a difference of nature, a difference which in itself and apart from any judge involves a difference of fate.

Thus, if I may sum up. It seems to me that Christ definitely discountenances any ritual or sacrificial approach to God. He prefers the synagogue to the Temple. He discountenances any idea of a legal relation between man and God—it is only love that matters: and love will adapt itself to changing circumstances and cannot be guided by exact rules. And although different men will inevitably meet with different fates, all alike will be the outcome of the divine love: it is misleading to think of God as a judge who exacts a legal penalty. His nature can only be rightly expressed in the term 'Father.'

THE MENACE OF DISESTABLISHMENT

By the Reverend Alfred Fawkes, M.A., author of *Shall we Disestablish?*

I.

THE fable of the dog who, crossing a plank over a stream with a bone in his mouth, and, seeing his reflection in the water, snapped at the second bone, and so lost the first, bears on the present position of the Church of England. For this Church has a bone, and a substantial one, in its mouth. It is affected indeed—what Church is not?—by the decline of religious observance characteristic of our generation; its congregations are increasingly scanty; its ordination candidates increasingly few. But it has not, like the Church of Rome, broken with knowledge; nor has it trespassed on what, for those who are not experts, is the dangerous ground of economics. It is still not only the National Church, but, in a real, if not the fullest, sense of the word, the Church of the Nation: it divides us less than any other would; it stands among us as an outward and visible sign of things unseen. A wise proverb reminds us that the better is the enemy of the good. We can imagine a more perfect Church, more liturgical forms of worship, a more impressive ritual than our own. But we may go further, and fare worse.

II.

The menace of Disestablishment has broken upon us like a bolt from the blue. In a mixed country like ours, a case may no doubt be made for it: why, it may be asked, should one out of many religious bodies be privileged above the rest? But the grievance, it is felt, is an abstract one. The disabilities under which Dissenters formerly laboured have been removed; the religious differences between the Established and the Free Churches are trifling; the economic position of the clergy is no longer such as to excite envy; the political and social prestige of the Church is rather a memory than a fact. It is from within that attack threatens: a catechism of Disestablishment might be compiled from the recent pronouncements of some of the most prominent Bishops; and, in slightly less guarded terms, from the columns of the *Church Times*.

III.

The rejection of the Prayer Book Revision Measure by the House of Commons last December was followed in high ecclesiastical quarters by warnings, or threats—I do not know which to call them—of a possible demand for disestablishment on the part of the Church; by the Church being apparently meant the restless and energetic party in the Church which assumes the monopoly of that name. It is possible that pressure was brought to bear upon the authorities—for it is improbable that the Archbishops are personally strong Disestablishers: but, be this as it may, they attempted to placate their unruly followers—I am not sure that 'followers' is the proper term—by the assurance that 'there are circumstances under which it might be their duty to take action in accordance with the Church's inherent spiritual authority.' Their followers, however, did not follow; Israel rebelled. The prelates were roughly reminded that their words were 'a carefully measured under-statement,' and 'studiously general and vague.' Perhaps so: it is a matter of opinion. But Archbishops are not accustomed to be addressed in this way. Certain modifications were introduced into the Book which was six months later submitted to Parliament; and different estimates of their value were made. If the opposition which it was proposed to disarm was Protestant, they were said to be substantial: if Anglo-Catholic, we were assured that they were merely elucidatory, matters of phrase and form. One was reminded of Walpole's Excise Bill of 1733. It was unpopular; and, strong minister as he was, he withdrew it. 'I will not be the minister,' he said, 'to enforce taxes at the expense of blood.' Later he was suspected of a design to reintroduce it in a slightly disguised form. He had no such design. 'I thought the measure was a good one; and I think it so still. But I am neither so foolish nor so obstinate as to set myself against the judgment of the House and of the country: so far as I am concerned, the Bill is dead.' Those in charge of the Revision Measure might have been better advised, and have left a finer record in history, had they followed his example. As it is, they acted at their own risk; and the consequences will be what they will be: there is no more to be said. But the ancient alliance between Church and State is seriously challenged; and we must consider where we stand. In 1919 the skilfully engineered 'Life and Liberty'

Movement caught Parliament napping, and the typically Lloyd Georgian Enabling Act was sprung upon us unawares. It was a step in the direction of Disestablishment: but it was a first step only. *Facilis descensus Averno!* To-day the *Church Times* tells us that 'no one takes the Church Assembly seriously'; and that 'it appears to be destined to an early grave.' Should it be so, its mourners will be few.

IV.

We are placed then, it appears, in this paradoxical position, that, while no political party desires to start a Disestablishment campaign—every party indeed would go out of its way to avoid the issue being raised—it may be forced upon us by a group of ecclesiastical Adullamites—'everyone that is in distress, or in debt, or discontented'; *i.e.* by a heterogeneous union of sectional Churchmen, far as the poles asunder from one another in every other conceivable respect, but agreed on the policy of scuttling the ship. The key to the whole is that from first to last the Church officials, the προϊσταμένοι, have miscalculated, and it is desired to 'save their face.' It is proper, if possible to do so; 'I am not going to lay hands on my father Parmenides.' But—not at this price.

V.

Not long ago a lively writer in the *Spectator* taxed me with holding that Establishment was 'The Church's One Foundation.' Well, there are, I think, circumstances under which it may be so; and I am not sure that the Church of England does not find itself in such circumstances to-day. The Reign of Law which Establishment guarantees is, in Dean Stanley's words, 'our safeguard against arbitrary Bishops and tumultuous Synods'; against revolutionary change in Church or State. To some this State Control, whether as exercised in legislation by Parliament or in law by the law courts, appears anomalous and even degrading. The wisest of English Bishops, Bishop Thirlwall, wrote:

> 'For my part I heartily rejoice that it is so. I consider it a ground for the deepest thankfulness, as one of the most precious privileges of the Church of England, that principles which I believe to be founded on justice, equity and common sense are still the rule of judgment in ecclesiastical causes. I earnestly hope that she may not be deprived of this blessing by the misguided zeal of some of her friends, from whom, I believe, she has at present more to fear than from the bitterest of her enemies.'[1]

[1] *Charge* of 1869.

VI.

So many red herrings have been drawn over the track that there is a danger of the real issue being missed. This is, first and foremost, political. What Parliament is called upon to decide is, primarily at least, not whether the proposed Book is scriptural or unscriptural, but whether it is in the interest of the nation that it should become law.

In itself there is nothing either scriptural or unscriptural in the official dress of the clergy, or in the liturgical canon, or in the reservation of the consecrated elements for the sick. These are matters of discipline and custom, not of doctrine: and

> 'Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change and abolish ceremonies of the Church ordained only by human authority, so that all things be done to edifying.'[2].

This takes us a long way.

> 'Those who reject Transubstantiation might with perfect consistency use the Roman Liturgy itself without curtailment or alteration (says Bishop Thirlwall); for the Canon of the Mass is so far from teaching that dogma that it positively protests against it, and can only be reconciled with it by the most violent artifices of interpretation. The Canon had been fixed many centuries before the dogma had been defined.'[3]

Circumstances, however, may make what is itself indifferent inexpedient and mischievous: nor, if we are wise, shall we follow authority blindly in such questions; Bishops are fallible, Churches and Councils 'have erred.'[4]

> 'Surely you will refer yourselves wholly to us (the Bishops) therein?' said Archbishop Parker to Wentworth—whom Hallam describes as 'the most distinguished asserter of civil liberty' in the then Parliament—that of 1575. 'No, by the faith I bear to God, I will not,' was his answer: 'we will pass nothing before we understand what it is. For that were to make you popes. Make you popes who list (I said); for we will make you none. And, Mr. Speaker, the speech seemed to me a pope-like speech; and I fear lest our Bishops do attribute this of the Pope's canons to themselves: *Papa non potest errare.*'[5]

To speak of the 'inherent spiritual authority of the Church,' or to describe the Church as an 'autonomous spiritual society within the nation,' is to use what Hobbes calls 'insignificant (or meaningless) speech.' The law recognizes no such authority, and no such society. 'The Clergy of England, when they cast off the Pope, submitted themselves to the civil power, and have

[2] *Article* XXXIV. [3] *Charge* of 1866.
[4] *Articles* XIX., XXI.
[5] Hallam. *Constitutional History of England*, ch. IV.

so continued,' says Selden. 'Chain up the clergy on both sides' —Prelatist and Puritan. 'Whose mouths must be held with bit and bridle': 'New Presbyter is but Old Priest writ large.'

VII.

'You lie at the catch,' says Talkative, in the *Pilgrim's Progress*. In the present connection it is, surely, a quibble to draw nice distinctions between Catholic *e.g.* and Roman Catholic; or Transubstantiation and the Real Presence . . . What the Reformation was, and is, a protest against, was not certain technically Roman forms of belief and worship, but unreformed Christianity; and not merely a particular metaphysical explanation of the *How* of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, but the supposed Miracle of the Mass. To saddle the Royal Commission of 1904 with the parentage of the Revised Book of 1927 is disingenuous; to do so is to throw dust in our eyes. Does anyone seriously suppose that in 1904 the Bishops would have entertained a proposal to legalize the Vestments? or to admit an alternative Liturgy? or to sanction Reservation under such conditions as to make it inevitable that the elements should be made the object of adoration? This would be to change the whole *type* of our public worship. It is urged that the proposed Revision is demanded by 'the Church.' Now the Assembly is not 'the Church,' nor has it power of attorney to speak for the Church. No one who has the slightest acquaintance with the composition and procedure of the electoral bodies created under the Enabling Act can think that they in any sense represent the great body of what are called 'Churchmen'; nor can it be argued without paradox that only 'Churchmen,' in the denominational sense of the word, are entitled to have a voice in the affairs of what is, after all, the National Church. The 'raging, tearing controversy' over the question of Establishment with which we are threatened is indeed a misfortune, and may become a disaster. But when the responsibility for the situation which has been created by the Revision proposals is shifted from their authors to their opponents, one is reminded of the Wolf and the Lamb. To represent the attitude of the opposition as partisan and confined to extremists is to misrepresent it; the traditional Church of England position, that of the Bishops of Norwich, Exeter, and Worcester, is left out of account. It is here that the

strength of the resistance in the country lies. The policy of Rehoboam spells shipwreck. It seems to an increasing number of thoughtful and religious, though not very vocal, men, that if, even at this eleventh hour, the advice of the Bishop of Norwich were taken, and the contentious features of the Measure withdrawn, much of the ground that has been lost might be recovered. A judicious revision of the Occasional Offices—Baptism, Marriage, Burial and the rest—would be welcomed. Not so the recasting of the Communion Service on what are called 'Catholic' lines. This means Disruption, Disestablishment, and (its corollary) Disendowment. It is becoming daily clearer that we cannot have it both ways, and must choose between the two.

VIII.

> 'The ground for a legislative alteration of a legal establishment is this, and this only (says Burke): that you find the inclinations of the majority of the people concurring with your own sense of the intolerableness of the abuse, to be in favour of a change.'[6]

In the matter of Revision no one will pretend that this is so. Nowhere, except among its compilers, is there the slightest sign of enthusiasm for the New Book. The general feeling is one of indifference—almost of boredom. 'Why can't you let it alone?' Its rejection by the House of Commons was generally welcomed. 'The dumb ass rebuked the madness of the prophet': it was felt that, not for the first time, the lay State had saved the Church from itself. There is no desire to make the position of Anglo-Catholics more difficult than it is. In this matter of rubrics no one wishes to impose a Chinese exactness; in the case of a united congregation a bishop acts on the maxim *omnia videt, multa dissimulat, pauca castigat*, and looks the other way. And if the doctrine and ceremonial of the Mass are to be allowed—and the New Book prohibits neither—I confess I cannot feel much enthusiasm about the prohibition of their secondary developments—such as what are called 'Devotions.' Is not this 'much ado about nothing?' or, if one may put it colloquially, eating the cow and worrying over the tail? The congregational principle may, and will inevitably, be extended: it is not in the direction of differences of belief or diversity of ceremonial, but in the matter of propaganda that the difficulty arises. For, if

[6] On the Act of Uniformity.

there is one thing which the recent debates in Parliament and discussions in the country have made clear, it is that public opinion and conscience will not tolerate a Romanist propaganda, the introduction of the *sacra peregrina* of the historian, under cover of the National Church. This is why the wiser Nonconformists concern themselves actively in the Revision controversy. They have every right to do so; because the Church of England is neither a sect nor a conventicle, but the *National* Church.

The object of the propaganda in question is announced as 'The Conversion of England'; by which is meant its reconversion to the form of Christianity against which the Reformation was a protest. It will not reconvert England to this form of Christianity; it was only on the dial of Ahaz that the shadow went back. But it may destroy the Church of England. A grave responsibility rests on those who lend a hand to this work. This Church is not the same thing as Anglicanism. It is finer, more spacious, and more inspiring. For the historical Church of England, 'this ancient house of our fathers,' many entertain a reverence and affection whom the thought of an 'Anglican Communion' leaves cold.

IX.

Before we expose the country and the Church to an internal conflict which (it seems) can only result in the loss of their power to give corporate expression to the religious life of the nation, let us ask ourselves seriously: What is to be gained?

Never was the theological atmosphere more highly charged with electricity. No more unsuitable moment for raising these delicate and dangerous questions could be conceived.

X.

'The 'God or Cæsar' alternative is irrelevant. The most important pronouncement which has been made on this, which is by far the gravest aspect of the controversy, is that of the Cambridge Divinity Professors, in *The Times* of February 4th:

> 'The cry of "State *versus* Church" that has been raised in the discussions on the Prayer Book seems to us to be so misleading that we ask you to allow us to say so in the *Times*. The vote in the House of Commons was indeed a vote on a spiritual issue—an issue which we believe to be momentous for the religion of the people of England. But it was not an attempt to force on the Church of England a form of religion against the will of the Church. On the contrary, we are

> convinced that the majority of the House of Commons reflected the religious sense and the spiritual judgment of a large majority of Church people.
>
> The Revised Prayer Book is the product of diplomatic arrangements made by Bishops and other officials of the Church, in the course of which we are sure that fundamental spiritual issues were blurred. These issues are clearer to some of those who had no part in the negotiations than they were to some of the negotiators. In some of the provisions of the Revised Prayer Book the people of the Church of England scent a form of religion which their fore-fathers at the Reformation repudiated. They do not want it for themselves or their children. This is really the spiritual issue, and on it the majority of the House of Commons guaged the spiritual convictions of the English Church better than the majority of the Bishops and the Church Assembly have hitherto done. If we are right in our reading of the facts, the arguments that are being used to inflame the minds of the Church people against State interference in spiritual concerns are as false as they are mischievous and subversive to the religious well-being of the people of England.'

Neither Parliament nor the courts claim to define doctrine: the former makes, the latter interpret, law. It is no doubt conceivable that circumstances should arise under which disobedience to the law would become a duty: courts, civil as well as ecclesiastical, are fallible; men, as well as clergymen, are men. But such circumstances are rare. The presumption is that the conscience of the community as a whole is more to be trusted than that of any section of the community. And the reason why sensible people are predisposed to take the side of the law against that of persons who come into conflict with it on the plea of conscience is that, with few, very few, exceptions, the law is right and they are wrong.

XI.

The objection that this country is no longer Christian need not be taken seriously. If its Protestantism was not affected by the repeal of the Penal Laws against Roman Catholics, its Christianity is still less so by the admission of a handful of Jews or Secularists to citizenship. The greater absorbs the less. As a fact, since the removal of these disabilities Parliament has given us legislation in advance of the Christianity of the Churches; philanthropy—which (after all) has something to do with the Christianity—has reached a higher level without than within their fold. While there are greater diversities of opinion between Churchmen and Churchmen than between Churchmen and Christians of other denominations: the sect

argument breaks down on its own ground. A Church rests on a broader basis. The Church of England, in particular, is established not because it teaches a particular theology, or possesses a particular succession; but because it represents the best mind and conscience of the community—the working in philosophical language, of Reason; in religions, of the Spirit in and among men. If it ceases to do this, if it reflects a sectional mind and a denominational conscience, the sufficient reason for its establishment disappears. Only by the frank acceptance of this, the historical and national as distinct from the sectarian standpoint, can the Church 'as by law established,' the Church as we and our fathers have known it, be retained. Religion would be the poorer for its loss; a time-honoured home of 'true religion and useful learning'—values not lightly to be dissociated—would have passed away. Were Disestablishment brought about under existing circumstances it would be attended by three notable results:

1. An increase of fanaticism in the country—and fanaticism, remember, is a very evil thing;
2. The strengthening of Romanising tendencies among Anglicans, and so (indirectly) of the Roman Catholic Church; and
3. The spiritual destitution of country districts, which would be left without adequate provision for their religious needs. Whether our rural populations could, or could not, supply these needs for themselves, it is certain that they would not do so; and that they would be deprived of a humanizing and civilizing influence, were they not supplied.

XII.

'In the event of Disestablishment the person about whom I am uneasy (says Macaulay) is the working man.'

In every community a large proportion of the citizens are mentally and morally minors. The State stands to such persons *in loco parentis*; and it performs only half its duty if it overlooks the ideal side of their lives. The present danger is two-fold: the first being our national apathy in the matter of ideas—we are all of us tired of this particular question, and want it out of the way; the second the chance that the position may be rushed by some sudden panic or passion, some revolutionary outbreak of fanaticism, such as that which, in connection with this unhappy Revision controversy, seems to have taken possession of ordinarily sober, moderate and reasonable men. This over, we may awake to find that we have 'loosely through silence, permitted things to pass away as in a dream.'

THE LIMITS OF COMPREHENSIVENESS*

By the Rev. J. S. Bezzant, M.A.,
Chaplain of Exeter College and Vice-Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford.

'Can two walk together except they be agreed.'—*Amos* iii, 3.

CAN two walk together except they be agreed? It has been the claim, nay the boast, of the Church of England that they can. The Reformation abolished all spiritual and temporal jurisdiction of the Pope within this realm of England. The Holy Scriptures were declared to be the final authority in matters of faith. But the formularies of our Church, as they emerged from successive revisions, contained no narrowly-defined or exclusive system of doctrine. The Prayer-book was a compromise. It was designed to exclude only those who excluded themselves, and these were expected to be few.

So it is that within the Church of England men have walked the way of the Christian life together while holding beliefs which other Christian bodies have felt to be incompatible with institutional unity. It has been the hope of many that while so walking together, fuller understanding would reduce the keener differences. The verdict of history, made clear by the progress (or retrogression) of Prayer-book Revision, is otherwise. It is true that all have realized the futility of outbreaks of sectarian passion. Nevertheless, differences have been narrowed down; they have become more acute; they are more easily recognizable. 'The most glorious Church in Christendom' is to-day tossed about with many a conflict and many a doubt. At a time when there is an unparalleled interest in religious matters, she neither ministers to it successfully nor guides it. Her influence is declining: money is not forthcoming in anything like the quantity that is vitally necessary: the number of ordinands does not replace the inevitable wastage.

I will not prolong a recital which has the weariness of an oft-told tale. There is a fact of even deeper import. It will force upon us an issue more fundamental than the adjustment of differing liturgical wishes within the English Church. This fact is the greatly increased activity of the Roman Catholic

[1] A Sermon preached in Westminster Abbey on Sunday, June 10, 1928.

Church in this country. It is a very successful activity. Its success is not due to any remarkable extension of Roman Catholicism among those of no religious faith: it is parasitic upon the Church of England. Rome receives about 12,000 converts every year, of whom the overwhelming majority are from the Church of England. It is absurd to suggest that they are *all* people of weak intelligence, or the spiritually lazy who care nothing if only religion can be made easy for them. Probably nowhere is Roman propaganda more successful than in Oxford: no one living there can fail to observe the large and steady growth of the Roman Catholic Church, both in numbers and prestige, during the last ten years; while it is notorious that many of the most able and influential Roman Catholic clergy were formerly members of our Church. On the one hand our Church is suffering from the silent desertion of people alienated by ideas and language in our services which, understood in their natural and historical sense, are incredible and often offensive: on the other hand there is the grave leakage to Rome. Together these threaten the very life of the Church of England.

The causes of this state of affairs are in no sense mysterious. They are as obvious as they are fundamental. Men naturally demand to know with reasonable clearness what they believe and why they believe it. This Rome tells them: the Church of England does not. In a world wherein so much is confusion she speaks with no certain voice. What is more serious, she is moved by no discernible principles. Hence the success of Rome at our expense. Men yearn for security; to know their place in creation; to feel at home in the scheme of things. No experience of the soul is so devastating as to feel lost in an ocean of immensity and confusion, with no sure foothold. When so much is uncertain and transitional, a Church which offers any kind of security can secure a loan of numerical success.

The position of the Church of England is one of peculiar difficulty. She denies the infallibility of other Churches and does not claim it. She declares the Bible to be the sufficient rule of faith. But during the past eighty years the attitude of all thinking men towards the Bible has been revolutionized. The character of our final authority in matters of faith has been profoundly affected. Whether Biblical criticism be conservative or radical is irrelevant to the fundamental principle involved

in it. That principle means, simply, that the Bible cannot be regarded as the sufficient guarantee of the truth of its contents. Biblical criticism (I quote Professor Clement Webb) 'involves a wholly different attitude towards the Bible from that which was common to all schools of Anglican theology in the middle of last century . . . the effects of which are destined to be very far-reaching.' They must be far-reaching indeed for a Church which accepts her creeds because 'they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.' The position is that no statement in Holy Scripture can of itself prove anything, if by 'prove' we mean 'to establish the truth of' a doctrine. It is no wonder if, among the multitudes who have retained in adult life the religious outlook of their childhood, there are thousands who feel vaguely that the bottom is out of the old system of belief. It is no wonder that confusion reigns.

And now, what is our hope? History confirms experience that infallibility is an illusion. It nowhere exists. The desire for it springs from a refusal to accept the manifest conditions of finite life. The challenge of Rome is fundamental. In the face of it, none can be wisely neutral. The 'erring elder sister' attitude towards Rome is both offensive and foolish. In face of such claims deferential respect is half-surrender. Nor has the real issue anything to do with futile controversies as to what exactly happened in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Now, we have to-day within the Church of England an active propaganda which is definitely Roman in outlook and in spirit; definitely Roman in its teaching about revelation, about ecclesiastical authority as a ground of belief, about the binding character of tradition; definitely Roman in its modes and forms of worship. In much wider circles it is denied that the Church of England, apart from Rome, has any independent authority for her members in matters of faith. There is a widespread and pathetic hope that infallibility will, in time, compromise with its own claim: longing eyes look piteously to Rome for recognition. Even the really liberal Anglo-Catholic scholars (such as the authors of the volume, *Essays Catholic and Critical*) who are, in reality, separated by an impassable gulf from this Pro-Roman and Rome-sick mentality, entirely fail to make the fact clear to the popular mind. Their authority is used in its support: they themselves use its language. In their hands theology

is largely a science for the explanation of terms which do not mean what they appear to say. One of them has recently allowed himself to say that Rome has never erred in matters of the faith until she declared herself to be incapable of doing so. Words obscure real issues. Indeed, but for the acute secularization of our modern life, Rome's converts would be many times more than they are.

By shirking this challenge within her own borders the Church of England is destroying the main reason for her independent existence and is becoming more and more a training-ground for future converts to Rome. It is becoming ever more and more clear that no Church which accepts a merely attenuated form of Roman Catholicism—something in essence the same, only less thorough-going—can ever again hope to maintain itself against Rome. There are but two conceptions of what faith and adherence to truth mean. One is that they involve a willingness to learn, openly and frankly to confess past error, to accept new facts, and to follow the light. The other is the essence of the Roman Catholic, popular Anglo-Catholic, and all kindred conceptions of religion. It is that they involve acceptance of the unchangeable opinions of the Church, speaking with the voice of God. In practice this means, however the fact may be disguised in pietistic phrases, the control of the individual conscience by other men acting in the name of Heaven. There can be no compromise between them. The two cannot walk together, for they are facing in opposite directions. There is no conceivable intellectual basis common to both of them. To persist in the hopeless task of trying to find one, and meanwhile to get along without any intellectual basis at all, satisfies neither type of mind, and will inevitably mean the loss of both. Our Church will not regain her prestige until she abandons her silent, half-hearted, invertebrate attitude in face of this choice, the terms of which become more clear and urgent every year. Herein is the real ground of opposition to the Romeward tendencies in the Revised Prayer-book. Increase of ceremony and ritual, restoration of supposed lost treasures of mediaeval piety may be harmless or even desirable. But it is fatal for our Church thus to approach nearer to Rome in externals while she obscures the gulf which separates in fundamentals, and so long as the basis of her own position is uncertain.

There is, moreover, no hope for the future in negation. Religion would be incomparably the poorer if Rome could now be miraculously destroyed. Human nature is such that there is likely to remain need for a Church which is as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land. But those who cannot accept her claim, who cannot live in the shadow, who feel it to be the shadow of death—these must realize that the supremacy of Roman Catholicism would be an almost unmixed evil. The essence of the system is such that it is only not disastrous when vigorously opposed. And Roman Catholicism can only be opposed with any hope of success by an ideal as universal and as thorough-going as its own, yet one which avoids its intolerable offence to reason. Half-measures are useless. What is the ideal? It is the whole-hearted acceptance of the principle that in the formulation of religious knowledge, as in all things else, the only way to knowledge is by the most careful and wide observation and comparison, endless experiment, endless docility to fact; the recognition that the appeal to the past, though useful as affording guidance and warning, can never be final in determining belief in the present. The most widespread agreement in the past about matters which had not yet become the problems they now are, or were then seen in a wholly different setting, may be utterly worthless. It may witness only to universal error. Some of the most stubborn doctrinal differences among us to-day concern, not vital experiences of the soul, but particular explanations of such experiences for which no positive evidence is forthcoming beyond assertions that it was so believed in the past. This is particularly true of our sacramental controversies.

We see in the world to-day a vast and ever-growing body of scientific knowledge resting on no other authority than its own verifiable truth and utility. It has greater authority than any authoritative religious system. The hope for the future of our Church lies in the acceptance of this lesson and in the application of the same methods, and in the same way, to the data of religion—to the Bible, and to the religious consciousness of mankind at its highest. So there will slowly be built up a positive theology which will replace the old. Men who differ will walk together because their direction and

objective will be the same. Such a theology will be Christian, for it will never transcend Jesus' revelation of the nature of God, and of the true nature of man, and of the true motives of human conduct. It will be permeated by His Spirit, and by His passion for reality. But the work will be prolonged, and there are many adversaries. With the inevitable loss of a false security the love of many will wax cold. Nevertheless, salvation depends upon endurance to the end. Following Christ involves a Cross. To-day that Cross is a stern measure of 'the discipline of incompleteness.' Yet faith need not suffer if only we are convinced on one or two main lines. When God's Spirit is at work in the world, there is always a crisis. Faith that will overcome the world must be able to stand many strains. Christian peace is not of the kind which owes its reality to the absence of the sword : it is peace within stress and conflict. The only peace which is a calm untroubled equilibrium is death. Seek it not; seek the things that are eternal. Our religious needs and the desire for truth both come from God : both are longings of the same soul. We need only faith to trust that the truth will always be an aid to those deep religious stirrings of the soul from which the impulse to seek the truth first proceeds, reflecting that we know of none who has sought the knowledge of God as diligently as other men seek wealth and honour, who has come away empty-handed.

BOOK REVIEWS

IDEAS AND IDEALS.*

Dean Rashdall was the most outstanding figure among Anglican Liberals of his day, he was at the same time a great Churchman who exercised on his generation a formative influence which spread far beyond the boundaries of any particular ecclesiastical party. Dr. Major and Mr. Cross have given us a selection from the Dean's literary remains which well reflects his massive and many-sided learning as theologian, historian, and philosopher; and yet, with the exception of the paper on 'The Metaphysic of Mr. Bradley,' there is little in the volume which may not be read with profit and understanding by the layman with no special equipment for approaching the subject matter.

The sweep of Dean Rashdall's learning enables him to consider the problems of to-day from a wider view-point than that of current controversy. In the paper on 'The Scholastic Theology' he pleads for a return to the

**Ideas and Ideals.* By Dean Hastings Rashdall. Edited by H. D. A. Major and F. L. Cross. (Basil Blackwell. 1928. Price 6/-.)

spirit of the great mediaeval Schoolmen whose honesty, clarity and thoroughness are very congenial to his own thought. 'The Scholastic Theology will teach us that, if we insist on raising speculative questions, we must face them as honestly and clearly and thoroughly as the Schoolmen tried to face them.' The Schoolmen 'ordinarily show a magnificent faith in Reason which is not always exhibited by modern theologians, and is absolutely abhorrent to a large proportion of modern religious people, who believe that God gave us Reason to be used only for the express purpose of deceiving us.' Dean Rashdall commends the Scholastic method of approach to the doctrine of the Trinity as an antidote to the Tritheism which taints much popular devotional language and thought. 'If the Church is to retain any hold over the intellect of the present day, nothing is more essential than that its Monotheism should be beyond dispute.' He deplores the teaching of modern theologians such as Canon Mason and Canon Peter Green who likened the relation between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to the relation between three men or other distinct centres of consciousness. He considers that such a theology must needs lead either to Tritheism or to the denial of any Trinity at all in the unity of the Godhead, and pleads for a return to the more rational Trinitarianism of the great Schoolmen. 'The doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as worked out by the Schoolmen, contains much with which even candidates for Holy Orders need not be troubled. But there is no reason why even peasants should not be taught that when the Church asserts that there is only one God, it really means what it says; and that the Trinity which it teaches is simply the Trinity of Power, Wisdom, and Love.'

In the paper entitled 'The Validity of Religious Experience,' Dean Rashdall, firm in his faith in the guidance of Reason, turns to an analysis and criticism of Mysticism. 'When a phrase becomes a "blessed word," it becomes a dangerous thing . . . In large circles "religious experience" is the "blessed word" of the moment; and that word is now employed with a laxity which tends—to say the least of it—to intellectual confusion.' He will come to no terms with an emotional mysticism which bases belief in God on intuition. 'I cannot see how a subjective emotion can prove the existence of its object.' He utterly repudiates the contention that religious experience *is* religion. Religion is concerned with objective truth and falsehood, and psychology is incompetent to judge whether a belief be true or false. The mystics have always been few, whereas the vast majority of Fathers, Schoolmen and modern theologians make no claim to immediate intuitive knowledge of God. But, even so, if the minority who claim such knowledge were agreed among themselves in what they tell us about God, he would still be prepared to attach great importance to their testimony. He finds no such agreement. 'I do not know a single proposition about God which is not asserted by some mystics to be self-evidently true, and by others to be self-evidently false.' He sets the highest value on the intuitions of the prophet, the poet, the man of religious genius, but Reason must provide the ultimate criterion. 'I hold with St. Paul that, while we should not quench the Spirit nor despise prophesyings, we should prove all things, and only hold fast to that which on reflection presents itself to us as true.' In the paper on 'The Alleged Immanence of God' he discusses the significance of another watchword which some twenty years ago obtained a wide currency through Dr. R. J. Campbell's 'New Theology.' He subjects the conception of Divine Immanence to a searching analysis from the philosophical, religious, and ethical standpoints, and concludes that it is a dangerous conception only tenable under drastic qualifications.

If a crude doctrine of Divine Immanence is ethically unsound, the substitutionary theory of the Atonement which is explicitly held in certain circles and taints the popular theology of much wider circles is thoroughly repugnant to morality. Dean Rashdall in the paper on 'Atonement' holds that any such theory is inconsistent with the teaching of Christ Himself, and is no essential part of orthodoxy. In the earliest Christian literature the doctrine is ethical and intelligible, but a process of degradation set in of which he traces the outline. The theology of the Atonement was purified by Abelard whose highly ethical theory was adopted and established by his great disciple Peter the Lombard. In dealing with the doctrine of the Atonement Dean Rashdall goes back, as he does when dealing with the doctrine of the Trinity, to Scholasticism at its best and noblest. The papers on the Atonement and on the Scholastic Theology will be invaluable to the parish priest. He will find in them exactly what is needed to meet the perplexities of the layman who has strayed into the maze of difficulties which has sprung up round the doctrines of the Trinity and the Atonement.

In the three papers 'The Rights of the State,' 'The Rights of the Church' and 'The Rights of the Individual,' Dean Rashdall discusses abstract questions of Social and Political Science. Church and State, he maintains, both exist for a moral end, the promotion of the highest kind of life. The only absolute right of the individual is the right to what he describes as 'Equality of Consideration.' Though Church and State may take different views as to their interests, 'real collision between the true interests of Church and State is as impossible as a want of coincidence between the convex and concave sides of the same curve.' Of special interest at the present moment is his dictum that 'the only way of settling whether this or that piece of State interference ought to be attempted by the State or to be submitted to by the Church, is to ask whether, under given circumstances, such interference will conduce to the end which Church and State alike have in view.' Necessarily in these papers the discussion is in the main abstract; but it is characteristic of the writer that his feet are always firmly planted on solid ground. His sturdy common sense keeps him in touch with facts. He is never a mere *doctrinaire*. His interesting and acute discussion of the desirability of an extension of educational opportunities, for example, is conditioned by a realism which is too often lacking in the utterances of the politician or educationalist who prides himself upon being a practical man.

The paper on 'The Idea of Progress' subjects to a careful analysis Dean Inge's brilliant generalisations in his well-known Romanes Lecture. That on 'The Metaphysic of Mr. F. H. Bradley' is a critical examination of the philosophical system of *Appearance and Reality*. Dean Rashdall has no hesitation in placing Bradley among the classics and handles him with the freedom naturally employed towards the great names of Philosophy. 'One is almost tempted to say that the greatest thinkers are just those who have made the greatest mistakes.'

Three papers, 'Modernism,' 'The Life of Newman,' and 'George Tyrrell,' deal with the trend of theological development during the last hundred years and the theological problems which confront the modern mind. The writer claims that the modern theologian should face modern problems with the same honesty and courage as the Schoolmen faced the problems of their day. 'To us Darwinism, the higher criticism, historical discovery, are what Aristotle and Averroes were to the men of the Thirteenth Century. If Christianity is to retain its hold upon the thinking and cultivated portion of the world, these difficulties must be grappled with in the

spirit, though not by the method, of St. Thomas Aquinas.' Modernism is no new thing. 'There has been in all ages a Liberal wing of the Church. In all ages—except possibly the very darkest in the Church's history—there have been Christian teachers who have attempted to interpret Christian doctrine in accordance with the best science of the day, to welcome and adopt newly discovered truth, to give up disproved errors, honestly to face intellectual difficulties.' The reader will find the sketch of German Liberalism and French Modernism illuminating. According to Dean Rashdall the French Modernist has the truer conception of historical development and of the function of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church, while the German Liberal has the truer estimate of the personal Christ and His influence. 'I believe we may learn,' he says, 'from both of these schools. And I believe that we in the English Church, if we take to facing theological problems as honestly and thoroughly as has been done by both the continental schools, will be able to combine what is true in both ways of thinking, and avoid the errors and exaggerations.' Here we catch a vision of the Church of England as a true 'bridge church.' It was not to be. The vision was shattered by the Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* of 1893. The recent Encyclical on Christian Union is its tomb. The phrase has become 'a blessed word' which is as misleading and mischievous as it is futile. So long however as thinkers of the courage and clarity of Dean Rashdall find a home in the Church of England we may justly claim for our Church a more profound spiritual continuity with the Catholic Church in its more creative epochs than any which can be claimed by the modern Roman Church which too often exhibits itself as 'a vast organisation for stopping in every direction the progress of knowledge, for checking all serious intellectual activity, and for driving intelligent men into infidelity, agnosticism, and secularism.'

G. L. H. Harvey.

ART AND THE REFORMATION.*

English readers who desire to know the truth about the Middle Ages owe much to the research and fearless writing of Dr. Coulton. His latest volume on *Art and the Reformation* is both illuminating and important. As we contemplate the ruins of some noble Gothic church two ideas are in all probability latent in our minds. The one, that this beautiful building was created and constructed by ecclesiastics, the other that the Reformation by discrediting the mediaeval theology and *cultus* destroyed the creative genius of Gothic architecture and art. The protagonists of the Romantic movement on the one hand, and the propagandists of the Roman Church on the other, are in some degree responsible for these mistaken ideas—for mistaken they are.

'Epigrammatic utterances of Goethe and Victor Hugo and Ruskin—epigrams with that strong alloy of exaggeration, and therefore of falsehood which is often necessary for making a brief generalization into current coin' represent the Romantic contribution to this popular error.

On the Roman propaganda side the chief source of the error would appear to be Montalembert in *Les Moines d'Occident*, relied on and cited by Lenoir, Professor de Wulf, Professor C. H. Moore and others, who teach that 'the monastic buildings were not only planned, and the works on them directed, by the monks, but they were also largely, if not entirely,

*Art and the Reformation. By G. C. Coulton, M.A., D.Litt. (Basil Blackwell. 1928. Price 25/-.)

constructed with their own hands. Artist monks were trained in sculpturing columns and statues, while others opened schools of painting, to which we owe our mediaeval wall frescoes and painted windows.' Dr. Coulton proves that monastic artists were the exception rather than the rule. Much of the work was done by laymen, some lay-brothers, some serfs, some members of the great mediaeval guilds of artizans, some even the victims of press-gangs. Unfortunately the men who paid for the work are often commemorated by name, but very seldom those who did the work.

What was it killed Mediaeval Art? It was not so much Protestantism as the Renaissance.

When confronted with the beauties of Greek classical antiquity in sculpture, in architecture, in literature, mediaeval art lost its power to charm. To many to-day, who love mediaeval art, this seems amazing, almost incredible, nevertheless it is true. The Renaissance sounded the knell of mediaeval art.

This becomes manifest when we note how it died as definitely in Italy, and Spain, and Southern France, where the mediaeval cultus and theology were retained, as it did in the countries of the Reformed Faith. Indeed in England it did not die as completely as it did in Italy.

But it is a pity to give the impression that Dr. Coulton's book is concerned mainly either with arid or fruitful controversy. The reader will no doubt close it with clearer views of the relation of monasticism to mediaeval art and of the relation of mediaeval art to the Renaissance than he had before reading it, but he will in addition experience a great enrichment of his knowledge of the Middle Ages. This book abounds in curious learning of all kinds, apposite illustrations from the most varied sources, and perhaps we need hardly add that moral force and spiritual fervour suffuse it. The reader is not only instructed but inspired.

Take for instance such a paragraph as the following :—

> 'It was Gothic art, sixty years ago, that first kindled in me the love of the Middle Ages. Afternoon service at St. Margaret's, Lynn, where even children might sit in the choir-stalls, and we walked to our places (*horresco referens!*) over two of the most beautiful monumental brasses in the world, and sat there under some of the fairest thirteenth century stonework and fourteenth century wood-carving in England, is an unforgettable recollection. In Westminster Abbey or one of our cathedrals, or sometimes at Mass in France, there is a glow of feeling and a rush of thought which warms and illuminates like sunshine. We are wrong if we do not welcome these things; but we are wrong also if we identify them too closely with the Christian religion. They may help us to worship God in spirit and in truth; but, on the other hand, they may stand between us and God. They were not there in the earliest days; the best of the primitive Christians did without them. If we care deeply for these things which St. Bernard and St. Francis neglected, it may possibly be because we have higher artistic sensibilities than they, but it certainly is not because we are more religious. The indiscriminate identification of art and a particular religion is no real compliment to either.'

This valuable book consists of more than 600 pages, contains a number of highly interesting illustrative plates and text-figures, is printed in large clear type, and possesses an index of 26 pages.

H. D. A. M.

THE CHURCH AND THE THEATRE.

Most people now regret the gulf between theatre and Church which was created largely by the attitude of the Puritans. That attitude is not always understood—especially in these days when it meets with small esteem. But although without doubt we do the Puritans less justice if we forget that their protests were occasioned mostly by what Milton described as 'the dishonest gestures of Trinculo's, Buffoons and Bawds,' yet it was less that they closed the theatres that mattered—a later generation easily (perhaps, too easily) remedied this—than that the result of their attitude was to cover the drama with suspicion if not with shame. To remove this has been a more lengthy matter. However, the recent effort to produce a Masefield play in Canterbury Cathedral is only one sign among many that the present generation is realising anew the importance of the drama: and one may feel a sense of satisfaction that the English Church has done something to restore *in practice* that alliance between religion and the drama which already exists *in purpose.*

And here is a book* by the Rural Dean of Mansfield which, as well as being interesting and well-written, offers an easy atmosphere of erudition. Mr. Elliott briefly traces the relationship between religion and dramatic art from early times and then discusses the meaning and purpose of tragedy as illustrated in Greek Drama. Most often it was concerned with a conflict of loyalties. 'Greek drama, which had sprung from Greek religion, and was primarily an expression of the worship of the Greek gods, was driven by its devotion to truth to strike the first blow at what was false in current belief' (p. 36). And it is something like this which Mr. Elliott finds to have been the service of drama throughout the ages: it has stood for reality as against conventionality whether in beliefs or morals. This explains why the writer has comparatively little to say about Mediaeval Miracle or Mystery plays but much of value to say about Shakespeare and the passion for freedom which Renaissance and Reformation promoted. 'Rightly considered,' he says, 'there is more religion in Shakespeare than in the professedly religious plays. He shows how certain great principles work in the lives of real men and women' (p. 61). With the writer we regret both the method and the results of the Puritan attack which 'handed the drama over to the worst influences.' But Mr. Elliott is unduly harsh if his strictures that the Puritan showed a lamentable lack of any faculty of literary appreciation': and 'of dramatic values they were ignorant' (p. 94) are meant to be taken widely. Ellwood, Baxter and Bunyan—to mention only three—wrote autobiographies so vivid and realistic that they were only a sublimated form of drama. But what about Milton and Marvell?

Mr. Elliott proceeds with a chapter on the French Classical Drama and an excellent one on Faust; and then sums up in a brief discussion of the moral basis. 'The drama seeks to lead its disciples along both these avenues pointing towards both truth and beauty—and it is an axiom that moral goodness lies in the same direction. . . The dramatist is not always a preacher; but if his face is towards the light he cannot be misleading the pilgrims who throng his path' (p. 134). A concluding chapter by Mr. C. F. Cameron (Dramatic Critic of the *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*) discusses the modern drama in its ethical aspects.

J. P. H.

**Religion and Dramatic Art.* By Spencer Elliott, M.A. (S.C.M. 1928. Price 4/6.)

THE MISREPRESENTED EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

It is customary, at least in clerical circles, to speak contemptuously of the condition of the Church of England in the middle of the eighteenth century. Bishop Butler's despairing refusal of the Primacy; the enthusiasm aroused among the lower classes by the Methodist Revival, the conviction of leading Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics that had it not been for their respective movements the Church of England would have sunk into decay and dissolution, all give the impression that the state of the Church of England in the eighteenth century was deplorable. Modern research is steadily removing that impression. The Church of England, notwithstanding the prevalence of clerical pluralism, the dominance of a strongly rationalist and utilitarian theology, and the consequent contempt for mysticism and enthusiasm, yet exercised a powerful moral, and indeed spiritual, influence in English life. Though a certain number of fashionable and dissolute persons might hold the Christian Religion up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule as it were by way of reprisals for its having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world, as Bishop Butler asserts in the preface to the *Analogy,* yet the great bulk, not only of the middle classes, but of the upper and lower classes, would appear to have been practising Christians, and the great proportion of these, practising Churchmen.

One of the latest contributions to this not unimportant subject is the recently published Volume I of *Archbishop Herring's Visitation Returns, 1743,* edited by the Rev. S. L. Ollard and the Rev. P. C. Walker for the Record Series of the Yorkshire Archaeological Society (1928). Here we have the ounce of fact which is worth a pound of theory. For those who are interested in the history of the Church of England, these returns are of great value. They are preceded by a delightful letter from the Archbishop.

The character of the returns can be judged from the two following selected at random.

215. ffangfoss, (Harthill).

i. We have here Nineteen families all perfectly conformd to the Church of England.
ii. We have no Licensed or Meeting house.
iii. We have no School here of any kind.
iv. We have fforty shilling p an : in house and land for ye repairs of ye Church undr. ye direction of ye Ministr. and Ch. Warden for ye time being, wch is regularly apply'd.
v. I reside at Thornton the usual place of Residnce (*sic*) time Immemorial.
vi. I serve the Ch. myself.
vii. I have several baptized but not confirmd wch I propose to present to your Grace for confirmation, I mean such as are qualified for it. I know of none yt. come to Church but who are baptiz'd.
viii. public Service is performd every ffortnight in the affternoon except on Sacrmt days in ye Morning which has been the custom time Immemorial.
ix. I catechise in ye Sunday after-noons after the 2d Lesson or else before ye congrgaon departs, but being no School in ye Parish the Parishnrs are backward in sending their charges to be Instructed.
x. The Sacrament is administered at Xtmas and Easter we have about fforty Communicants more or less, the Number being uncertain.

xi. I give timely warning of the Sacrament as the Rubric directs, but ye Parishnrs. do not send in their Names as required. I never refused the Sacrament to any one.

212. fflambrough (Dickering).

i. Families about one hundred and Twenty.—Dissenters none.
ii. Consequently no meeting house nor Teacher.
iii. None.
iv. None.
v. No.—the reason is because the Yearly stipend is but very small, being only sixteen pounds p. annum—and the proper Incumbent is an old craz'd Man and resides at Hornsea wch. is 10 miles distat (sic).
vi. The assistant Curate (whose Allowance or Yearly stipend is only Eight Pounds) resides at Bridlington about 2 miles from Flambrough wch. is contiguous to both this Cure and that of Bempton.
vii. None.
viii. Once only, for reasons above.
ix. During the whole Time of Lent The Parishioners send yr. Childn. etc. duly.
x. Three Times a Year. At Easter last about one Hundred and Twenty.
xi. Yea—The Parishioners do not send in yr. names—The Sacramt. has not been refus'd to any.
None.

The points which have impressed us most in reading this volume are the fewness of Dissenters, the very large number of Church communicants, the small stipends of the clergy, and their loyalty to the Established Church.

The Rev. S. L. Ollard has contributed a valuable preface. He points out noting that Roman Catholics are called sometimes 'Papists,' sometimes 'Romans,' but never *simpliciter* 'Catholics.' It is interesting to note in this connection that Archbishop Blackburn (Herring's predecessor) issued Letters Dimissory 'to any Catholic Bishop' in the case of ordinands who betook themselves to Chester, Carlisle, Lincoln, etc. Baptists in these returns are sometimes called 'Dippers,' and members of the Society of Friends are always called 'Quakers.' Although the Wesleys had only recently organized their movement, Methodists are mentioned in 22 returns. Moravians are also mentioned. The Holy Communion was usually celebrated four times a year when great numbers, owing partly to the severity of Church discipline, communicated. We should have been glad if Mr. Ollard had presented the evidence for his conclusion that 'communicants' in the returns mean 'potential communicants.' We confess to not feeling convinced. It is interesting to note (at St. Mary's, Nottingham) on Easter Day a celebration of the Holy Communion at 6 a.m. and at noon.

The returns contain numerous references to public penance. What pathos lies behind such a reference as this!

'*Fornication*,—C.D. and A.B. She, excomd. and dened.; he went to Carthagena.' [No. 218.]

Many thousands of English soldiers succumbed during the siege of that South American city.

The conclusion of Mr. Ollard is worth recording:

> 'It seems from these records that though the Church was, on the whole, doing her work far better and more thoroughly than is commonly supposed, yet she lacked the 'zeal' and 'fire of love' which those Revivals [Methodist, Evangelical, and Tractarian] in their turn, supplied' (p. xxiii).

Perhaps the Church historian of the future will feel compelled to assert that all Church Revivals are necessary evils like the taking of stimulants.

H. D. A. M.

CHRISTIANITY AS LIFE.*

To those who study its teaching and practice through the ages Christianity often offers at once the highest inspiration and the deepest despair. 'I find,' once wrote Schiller to Goethe, 'in the Christian religion virtualiter the framework of all that is highest and noblest, and the various manifestations of it which we see in life appear to me to be so repellent and absurd because they are unsuccessful representations of this Highest.' This is certainly a widespread conviction: must we also regard it as inevitable? The gulf between what we know as the highest practice of Christianity and the ideal itself is certainly wide: but at any rate we are aware of the gulf, and we view it, not with the cynicism of the person who said 'there has been but one Christian—and he was crucified,' but with a critical appreciation of its causes which should do something to bridge it. This is the chief use and justification of Mr. Grubb's book, which sets out to show the value of Christianity, not as a dogma, a philosophy or an institution, but as an inspiration. As a Quaker, he has many stringent criticisms to offer of the historical development of the Church. With many of these criticisms—*e.g.*, of the value of sacraments or the necessity for compromise—we do not agree; but Mr. Grubb always states his views clearly and fairly, and therefore helpfully.

He begins by a character-study of Jesus, estimating his influence on the disciples and its relation to the Crucifixion and Resurrection. In this carefully-balanced estimate the apocalyptic thought of Jesus finds a due, but not an overwhelming, place. About the establishment of the Kingdom, for instance, Jesus believed that it 'would come when men were perfectly attuned to the will of God—full of faith and heartfelt obedience. In His own consciousness He knew that this condition was being fulfilled. He felt Himself to be God's "Son," with no cloud of self-will hiding the Father's face. In Him, therefore, the Kingdom was already breaking through. His evident power over the evil spirits confirmed the testimony of His own consciousness; and the fact that He was able to impart such power to others showed Him that the world was passing from the dominion of evil to the rule of God. . . .' (p. 44). Hence the most significant note of the Apostolic Fellowship was its simplicity: intellectual belief and formal organization played a very secondary part in early Christianity, which was 'essentially an experience, individual and collective, of new life with God and new relations with men' (p. 96). And in this happy experience of life 'in Christ' men found the real fulfilment of their longing for salvation.

A later section deals with the growth of the Christian Church, and traces the way in which simplicity was lost and inspiration was sacrificed

**Christianity as Life.* By Edward Grubb, M.A. (Swarthmore Press. Pp. 286. 1928. Price 7/6.)

to system. 'If Irenaeus and his successors saved the Church from the calamity of immediate division, they did so at the cost of building up its unity on false foundations—the foundations of uniformity of belief and rigidity of organization' (p. 155). With regard to the sacraments, we believe that Mr. Grubb greatly underestimates the value of symbolism, for symbols help the mind to appreciate things otherwise beyond its power. But at the same time, we recognize the cogency of many of his criticisms. That baptism in mediaeval times was largely a formality in which a misplaced word invalidated the ceremony, we know from abundant evidence, and even to-day we have not yet banished its magical character for many. Recently, the matron of a nursing-home asked the reviewer for special arrangements for a baptism since a child had been placed under her care, and she said, 'I could not undertake the awful responsibility of having an unbaptized child beneath my roof.'

The last part of the book deals with the effect of Christianity upon human life and happiness. By stressing the real worth of every human personality, the Church has reduced cruelty and revolutionized home-life; and, if its record in regard to personal liberty is not too clean, at least it has fostered a sense of responsibility to God which has caused a progressive development. A chapter on 'Christianity and War' is a reasoned plea for pacificism; but we doubt whether it will convince many. No Church is ever likely again to teach that to wage war is anything but an outrage on God's world: a Christian should *ipso facto* strive for peace and for the development of peace-promoting institutions such as the League of Nations. But if a country is faced with a war of aggression, we fail to see that pacificism will be a *solution*: at any rate, there is little likelihood of its being so widepsread a conviction as to 'prevent men from responding to their country's call'—which is apparently what Mr. Grubb desires (p. 269).

But in spite of many points of disagreement, we commend this book as a contribution to the understanding and practise of Christianity. The reader, on laying it down, will recall the words of Abraham Lincoln: 'Find me a Church which stands for the two great commandments of love for God and love for our neighbours, and knows no other creed but that sublime summary of human duty, and I will join it heart and soul.'

J.P.H.

THE CHILDREN'S KINGDOM.*

We have often been asked to recommend a book of religious devotion suitable for young children of to-day, which would do for them what Victorian books of simple religious instruction did for a past generation. The nearest approach to the desired book that we have come across is *The Children's Kingdom*, by Gwendoline Watts. It probably is not so Modernist as some would wish, but it is the right kind of Modernism for children. This is no *à priori estimate*. It attracts little girls. We do not know how it works in the case of little boys. It seems to have the advantage that it does not require a teacher. That is a mark of the real child's book. You give it the child, or perhaps you lend it. If you do the latter, and the child asks for leave to borrow it again, you can feel pretty sure that it is the right kind of book. *The Children's Kingdom* is pleasantly illustrated by Susan Frances Perrin, and printed in nice clear large type.

*Published by Basil Blackwell. Price 5/- net.

SHORT NOTICES.

In *The Psychology of Christian Faith* (S.C.M., price 7/6) Dr. Vernon Bartlet has edited some selections from the writings of the late French Protestant, Gaston Frommel, and has also contributed an introduction in which he estimates the place of Frommel in the modern world of thought. Probably few English readers will have heard of Frommel: it may be sufficient here to point out that he was Professor of Theology in the University of Geneva for more than a decade before his death in 1906 and that, well aware of the failure of traditional doctrine to keep pace with modern knowledge, he set out to remedy this by rooting theology more directly in individual experience. 'The precarious condition of present-day Christianity is occasional, not fundamental. A certain kind of theology has brought us into it; another can bring us out. That better theology is now at work among us and is preparing for us a better future' (p. 96). The special feature of Frommel's message, as shown in this selection, is his vivid appeal to concrete psychological experience. The central human fact of Conscience and the fact of evil; redemption in Christ—the fact and its significance; moral obligation, considered not (with Kant) as a law inherent in the will but as essentially an experience not excluding analysis, but superior to it; prayer and its moral and psychological conditions: these are some of the things on which this selection has much to say that is interesting, helpful and essentially thought-provoking. To Dr. J. M. Wilson is due a debt of thanks for an excellent translation from the French.

The Divine Revolution (W. G. Peck, S.C.M.; 6/-) is a study in the Passion of Christ and is divided into three parts concerning the Motive, Incidence, and Results of the Passion. The author's view is that whereas man by his own free activities inevitably involved himself in irreparable disaster, he was saved by a mighty revolution in which God broke in on history to undo human chaos. Hence we are shown 'the Cross as a Revolution inaugurated within the heart of the Everlasting: the supreme towering event of time . . .' (p. 69). In spite of Mr. Peck's arguments we cannot accept what is the underlying assumption of the whole book that the death of Christ was the point in time towards which the rest of His life was preparatory and that it had on this account a unique efficacy. Mr. Peck rarely carries conviction with his argument: his language is sentimental and he piles up metaphors in a confusing way. What are we to make of this passage? 'In Him the sacred seat of life and love was to be defiled by the coarse hands of death and hate. Loyalty to the Infinite Society which is God, pity for the needs of men, broke His great heart, and He sweated drops of blood. He, God and Man, was to be the victim of God's love and man's hate. In Him the Eternal love was to be deeply insulted. In Him the Holy God was to be gibbetted as a criminal' (p. 68). There are better things in the book than this, especially in the last chapter, which deals with the Church's opportunity to-day. But even here Mr. Peck ends with the meaningless appeal of the words of the hymn:

> 'Let me evermore abide
> Hidden in Thy wounded side.'

The modern generation, we believe, will less and less sing that kind of sentiment, let alone, as Mr. Peck suggests, 'pray it with profound sincerity.'

Those who wish to gain a general idea of the course of Church History during the first thirteen centuries, will find *A Study of Church History* (G. W. Butterworth, D.D., S.C.M., 2/6) helpful. The writer aims—with a

fair amount of success—at an impartial survey: but the result is a curious vagueness in places. What theory, *e.g.*, does he intend to convey by 'Apostolic Succession' when he says that 'at Rome Hegesippus made a 'succession,' *i.e.* apparently, a list of bishops' (p. 45)? Again, the statement that Tertullian's doctrine was strictly orthodox is questionable; as also is the view that 'for long (*i.e.* before his election to the Papal seat) the controlling hand behind the Papacy had been Hildebrand (*sic*)' (p. 125). And is not a false idea of the significance of Abelard's *Sic et Non* suggested by the brief comment that in it 'he placed side by side passages of the Fathers which contradicted each other without offering any explanation' (p. 150)? The book illustrates Abelard's stand for the principle of free enquiry in religion and in a sense it originated the Scholastic theology. Dr. Butterworth packs a good deal of information into his 168 pages.

J. P. H.

CORRESPONDENCE

RAISE THE STONE.

SIR,

A quotation in the June *Modern Churchman* (p. 120) tempts me to raise a question whether the pantheistic interpretation invariably attributed to the Logion—'Raise the stone and thou shalt find me, cleave the wood and there am I,' is necessarily the right one.

To begin with, to be consistent with such an interpretation one would surely expect the first verb to imply 'splitting' or 'rending' rather than merely 'raising.' And secondly, would even the most convinced believer in Divine Immanence expect to find God by such a process?

I should be glad to know whether the original language would bear an entirely different interpretation, namely raise = erect the stone, *i.e.* build an altar; and cleave the wood, *i.e.* for sacrifice.

Taken with its context ('where there are two, they are not without God, and wherever there is one alone, I say, I am with him. Raise the stone,' etc.) the import of the whole Logion would thus consistently imply the near presence of God wherever and whenever man has faith enough to worship Him. Compare the sacrifice of Abraham and of Elijah.

I should be much interested to learn from scholars whether this view is tenable.

E. D. HERSCHEL.

Church Farm.
Warfield, Bracknell.
June 29th, 1928.

[We agree with our correspondent's general interpretation of the Logion.

The Greek word is rightly translated *raise* in the sense of *erect*. It is used of the resurrection in the sense of *rouse*. It cannot possibly mean *split*.

The Logion is not pantheistic. S. T. Coleridge said on one occasion: 'Don't say "God is everywhere"—that is pantheistic. Say rather, "Everywhere that I am, I am in the presence of God."' The Logion does not say: 'God is everywhere, but 'Wherever you are you may worship God.' By the ancient law (*Book of the Covenant*) the altar had to be constructed of *unhewn* stone. 'If thou hast lifted up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it.' Almost anywhere in Palestine the rough stones of the hillside could be piled up to form a primitive altar. —ED. *M.C.*]